

Almost Periodic Solutions of Evolution Differential Equations with Impulsive Action

Viktor Tkachenko

Abstract In an abstract Banach space we study conditions for the existence of piecewise continuous, almost periodic solutions for semilinear impulsive differential equation with fixed and non-fixed moments of impulsive action.

1 Introduction

We consider the problem of the existence of piecewise continuous, almost periodic solutions for the nonlinear impulsive differential equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (A + A_1(t))u = f(t, u), \quad t \neq \tau_j(u), \quad (1)$$

$$u(\tau_j(u) + 0) - u(\tau_j(u)) = B_j u + g_j(u), \quad j \in Z, \quad (2)$$

where $u : R \rightarrow X$, X is a Banach space, A is a sectorial operator in X , $A_1(t)$ is some operator-value function, $\{B_j\}$ is a sequence of some closed operators, and $\{\tau_j(u)\}$ is an unbounded and strictly increasing sequence of real numbers for all u from some domain of space X .

We use the concept of piecewise continuous almost periodic functions proposed in [7]. Points of discontinuities of these functions coincide to points of impulsive actions $\{\tau_j\}$. We mention the remarkable paper [19], where a number of important statements about almost periodic pulse system was proved. Then these results were included in the well-known monograph [18]. Today there are many articles related to the study of almost periodic impulsive systems (see, for example, [1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 15, 21, 22, 24]). In the papers [8, 23, 27, 28] almost periodic solutions for abstract impulsive differential equations in the Banach space are investigated.

Viktor Tkachenko

Institute of Mathematics National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Tereshchenkivska str. 3, Kiev,
Ukraine e-mail: vitk@imath.kiev.ua

In this paper, we consider the semilinear abstract impulsive differential equation in a Banach space with sectorial operator in the linear part of the equation and some closed operators in linear parts of impulsive action. Using fractional powers of operator A and corresponding interpolation spaces allows us to consider strong or classical solutions. Note that such equations with periodic right-hand sides were first studied in [17]. In equations with nonfixed moments of impulsive action, points of discontinuity depend on solutions; that is, every solution has its own points of discontinuity. Moreover, a solution can intersect the surface of impulsive action several times or even an infinite number of times. This is the so-called pulsation or beating phenomenon. We will assume that solutions of (1), (2) don't have beating at the surfaces $t = \tau_j(u)$; in other words, solutions intersect each surface no more than once. For impulsive systems in the finite-dimensional case, there are several sufficient conditions that allow us to exclude the phenomenon of pulsation (see, [18], [20]). In infinite dimensional case analogous conditions cannot easily be verified. In every concrete case one needs a separate investigation.

We assume that the corresponding linear homogeneous equation has an exponential dichotomy. The definition of exponential dichotomy for an impulsive evolution equation corresponds to the definition of exponential dichotomy for continuous evolution equations in an infinite-dimensional Banach space [5, 9, 16]. We require that only solutions of a linear system from an unstable manifold can be unambiguously extended to the negative semiaxis.

Robustness is an impotent property of the exponential dichotomy [5, 10, 16]. We mention the papers [4, 14, 25, 26] where the robustness of the exponential dichotomy for impulsive systems by small perturbations of right-hand sides is proved. In this chapter we prove robustness of the exponential dichotomy also by the small perturbation of points of impulsive action. We use a change of time in the system. Then approximation of the impulsive system by difference systems (see [9]) can be used. If a linear homogeneous equation is exponentially stable, we prove stability of the almost periodic solution of nonlinear equation (1), (2). Following [17], we use the generalized Gronwall inequality, taking into account singularities in integrals and impulsive influences.

This chapter is organized as follows. In Sect.7.2 we present some preliminary definitions and results. In Sect.7.3, we study an exponential dichotomy of impulsive linear equations. Section 7.4 is devoted to studying the existence and stability of almost periodic solutions in linear inhomogeneous equations with impulsive action and semilinear impulsive equations with fixed moments of impulsive action. In Sect.7.5 we consider impulsive evolution equations with nonfixed moments of impulsive action. In Sect.7.6 we discuss the case of unbounded operators B_j in linear parts of impulsive action.

2 Preliminaries

Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be an abstract Banach space and R and Z be the sets of real and integer numbers, respectively.

We will consider the space $\mathcal{PC}(J, X)$, $J \subset R$, of all piecewise continuous functions $x : J \rightarrow X$ such that

i) the set $\{\tau_j \in J : \tau_{j+1} > \tau_j, j \in Z\}$ of discontinuities of x has no finite limit points;

ii) $x(t)$ is left-continuous $x(\tau_j - 0) = x(\tau_j)$ and there exists $\lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_j + 0} x(t) = x(\tau_j + 0)$.

We will use the norm $\|x\|_{PC} = \sup_{t \in J} \|x(t)\|$ in the space $\mathcal{PC}(J, X)$.

Definition 1. The integer p is called an ε -almost period of a sequence $\{x_k\}$ if $\|x_{k+p} - x_k\| < \varepsilon$ for any $k \in Z$. The sequence $\{x_k\}$ is almost periodic if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a relatively dense set of its ε -almost periods.

Definition 2. The strictly increasing sequence $\{\tau_k\}$ of real numbers has uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a relatively dense set of ε -almost periods common for all sequences $\{\tau_k^j\}$, where $\tau_k^j = \tau_{k+j} - \tau_k, j \in Z$.

By Samoilenko and Trofimchuk [21], the sequence $\{\tau_k\}$ has uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences if and only if $\tau_k = ak + c_k$, where $\{c_k\}$ is an almost periodic sequence and a is a positive real number.

By Lemma 22 ([18], p. 192), for a sequence $\{\tau_j\}$ with uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences there exists the limit

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{i(t, t+T)}{T} = p \quad (3)$$

uniformly with respect to $t \in R$, where $i(s, t)$ is the number of the points τ_k lying in the interval (s, t) . Then for each $q > 0$ there exists a positive integer N such that on each interval of length q there are no more than N elements of the sequence $\{\tau_j\}$; that is, $i(s, t) \leq N(t-s)/q + N$.

Also for sequence $\{\tau_j\}$ with uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences there exists $\Theta > 0$ such that $\tau_{j+1} - \tau_j \leq \Theta, j \in Z$.

Definition 3. The function $\varphi \in \mathcal{PC}(R, X)$ is said to be W-almost periodic if

i) the strictly increasing sequence $\{\tau_k\}$ of discontinuities of $\varphi(t)$ has uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences;

ii) for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a positive number $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon)$ such that if the points t' and t'' belong to the same interval of continuity and $|t' - t''| < \delta$ then $\|\varphi(t') - \varphi(t'')\| < \varepsilon$;

iii) for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a relatively dense set Γ of ε -almost periods such that if $\tau \in \Gamma$, then $\|\varphi(t + \tau) - \varphi(t)\| < \varepsilon$ for all $t \in R$ that satisfy the condition $|t - t_k| \geq \varepsilon, k \in Z$.

We consider the impulsive equation (1), (2) with the following assumptions:

(H1) A is a sectorial operator acting in X and $\inf\{\operatorname{Re}\mu : \mu \in \sigma(A)\} \geq \delta > 0$, where $\sigma(A)$ is the spectrum of A . Consequently, the fractional powers of A are well defined, and one can consider the spaces $X^\alpha = D(A^\alpha)$ for $\alpha \geq 0$ endowed with the norms $\|x\|_\alpha = \|A^\alpha x\|$.

(H2) The function $A_1(t) : R \rightarrow L(X^\alpha, X)$ is Bohr almost periodic and Hölder continuous, $\alpha \geq 0$, $L(X^\alpha, X)$ is the space of linear bounded operators $X^\alpha \rightarrow X$.

(H3) We shall use the notation $U_\rho^\alpha = \{x \in X^\alpha : \|x\|_\alpha \leq \rho\}$. Assume that the sequence $\{\tau_j(u)\}$ of functions $\tau_j : U_\rho^\alpha \rightarrow R$ has uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences uniformly with respect to $u \in U_\rho^\alpha$ and there exists $\theta > 0$ such that $\inf_u \tau_{j+1}(u) - \sup_u \tau_j(u) \geq \theta$ for all $u \in U_\rho^\alpha$ and $j \in Z$. Also, there exists $\Theta > 0$ such that $\sup_u \tau_{j+1}(u) - \inf_u \tau_j(u) \leq \Theta$ for all $j \in Z$ and $u \in U_\rho^\alpha$.

(H4) The sequence $\{B_j\}$ of bounded operators is almost periodic and there exists $b > 0$ such that $\|B_j u\|_\alpha \leq b \|u\|_\alpha$ for $j \in Z, \alpha \geq 0$ and $u \in X^\alpha$.

(H5) The function $f(t, u) : R \times U_\rho^\alpha \rightarrow X$ is continuous in u and is locally Hölder continuous and W -almost periodic in t uniformly with respect to $u \in U_\rho^\alpha$.

(H6) The sequence $\{g_j(u)\}$ of continuous functions $U_\rho^\alpha \rightarrow X^\alpha$ is almost periodic uniformly with respect to $u \in U_\rho^\alpha$.

Remark 1. Assumption (H4) is satisfied if, for example, $B_j A = A B_j$ for all $j \in Z$. We assume that operators B_j are bounded. Many of our results are valid if the B_j are unbounded closed operators $X^{\alpha+\gamma} \rightarrow X^\alpha$ for $\alpha \geq 0$ and some $\gamma > 0$. We discuss this case in the last section.

We use the following generalization of Lemma 7 from [7], p. 288 (also, see [6] and [19]):

Lemma 1. *Assume that a sequence of real numbers $\{\tau_j\}$ has uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences, the sequence $\{B_j\}, B_j \in X$, is almost periodic and the function $f(t) : R \rightarrow X$ is W -almost periodic. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a such $l = l(\varepsilon) > 0$ that for any interval J of length l there are such $r \in J$ and an integer q that the following relations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_{i+q} - \tau_i - r| &< \varepsilon, \quad \|B_{i+q} - B_i\| < \varepsilon, \quad i \in Z, \\ \|f(t+r) - f(t)\| &< \varepsilon, \quad t \in R, \quad |t - \tau_j| > \varepsilon, \quad j \in Z. \end{aligned}$$

If A is a sectorial operator then $(-A)$ is an infinitesimal generator of the analytical semigroup e^{-At} . For every $x \in X^\alpha$ we get $e^{-At} A^\alpha x = A^\alpha e^{-At} x$. Further, we shall use the inequalities (see [9])

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^\alpha e^{-At}\| &\leq C_\alpha t^{-\alpha} e^{-\delta t}, \quad t > 0, \quad \alpha > 0, \\ \|(e^{-At} - I)u\| &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} C_{1-\alpha} t^\alpha \|A^\alpha u\|, \quad t > 0, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1], \quad u \in X^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_\alpha \in R$ is nonnegative and bounded as $\alpha \rightarrow +0$.

Definition 4. The function $u(t) : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow X^\alpha$ is said to be a solution of the initial value problem $u(t_0) = u_0 \in X^\alpha$ for Eq. (1), (2) on $[t_0, t_1]$ if

- (i) it is continuous in $[t_0, \tau_k], (\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}], \dots, (\tau_{k+s}, t_1]$ with the discontinuities of the first kind at the moments $t = \tau_j$ of intersections with impulsive surfaces;
- (ii) $u(t)$ is continuously differentiable in each of the intervals $(t_0, \tau_k), (\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}), \dots, (\tau_{k+s}, t_1)$ and satisfies Eqs. (1) and (2) if $t \in (t_0, t_1), t \neq \tau_j$, and $t = \tau_j$, respectively;
- (iii) the initial-value condition $u(t_0) = u_0$ is fulfilled.

We assume that solutions $u(t)$ of (1), (2) are left-hand-side continuous, hence $u(\tau_j) = u(\tau_j - 0)$ at all points of impulsive action.

Also we assume that in the domain U_p^α solutions of (1) and (2) don't have beating at the surfaces $t = \tau_j(u)$; in other words, solutions intersect each surface no more than once.

3 Exponential Dichotomy

Together with Eq. (1), (2) we consider the corresponding linear homogeneous equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (A + A_1(t))u = 0, \quad t \neq \tau_j, \quad (4)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t=\tau_j} = u(\tau_j + 0) - u(\tau_j) = B_j u(\tau_j), \quad j \in Z, \quad (5)$$

where $\tau_j = \tau_j(0)$. Denote by $V(t, s)$ the evolution operator of the linear equation without impulses (4). It satisfies $V(\tau, \tau) = I$, $V(t, s)V(s, \tau) = V(t, \tau)$, $t \geq s \geq \tau$.

By Theorem 7.1.3 ([9], p.190), $V(t, \tau)$ is strongly continuous with values in $L(X^\beta)$ for any $0 \leq \beta < 1$ and

$$\|V(t, \tau)x\|_\beta \leq L_Q(t - \tau)^{(\gamma - \beta)_-} \|x\|_\gamma, \quad (6)$$

where $(\gamma - \beta)_- = \min(\gamma - \beta, 0)$, $t - \tau \leq Q$, $L_Q = L_Q(Q)$. Moreover,

$$\|V(t, \tau)x - x\|_\beta \leq L_Q(t - \tau)^\nu \|x\|_{\beta + \nu}, \quad \nu > 0, \beta + \nu \leq 1. \quad (7)$$

Using the proof of Lemma 7.1.1 from [9], p. 188, one can verify the following generalized Gronwall inequality

Lemma 2. Suppose $0 \leq \alpha, \beta < 1, a_1 \geq 0, a_2 \geq 0, b \geq 0, 0 < Q < \infty$ and $y(t)$ is non-negative function locally integrable on $0 \leq t < Q$ with

$$y(t) \leq a_1 + a_2 t^{-\alpha} + b \int_0^t (t - s)^{-\beta} y(s) ds$$

on this interval; then there is a constant $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(\beta, b, Q) < \infty$ such that

$$y(t) \leq \left(a_1 + \frac{a_2}{(1-\alpha)t^\alpha} \right) \tilde{C}(\beta, b, Q). \quad (8)$$

Note that inequality (8) can be rewritten as

$$y(t) \leq \left(a_1 + \frac{a_2}{t^\alpha} \right) \tilde{C}_1, \quad \tilde{C}_1 = \frac{\tilde{C}(\beta, b, Q)}{1-\alpha}. \quad (9)$$

We will use the following perturbation lemma.

Lemma 3. *Let us consider the perturbed equation*

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (\gamma A + A_2(t))u = 0, \quad (10)$$

where $\gamma = \text{Const} > 0$, $A_2(t) : R \rightarrow L(X^\alpha, X)$.

Then for $Q > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $|\gamma - 1| \leq \varepsilon$, $\sup_t \|A_1(t) - A_2(t)\|_{L(X^\alpha, X)} \leq \varepsilon$ the evolution operators $V(t, s)$ of (4) and $V_1(t, s)$ of (10) satisfy

$$\|V(t, s) - V_1(t, s)\|_\alpha \leq R_1(\varepsilon), \quad t - s \leq Q, \quad (11)$$

with $R_1(\varepsilon)$ depends on Q, α , and $R_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. For definiteness let $\gamma > 1$. Solutions $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ of Eqs. (4) and (10) satisfy the following integral equations

$$x(t) = e^{-A(t-t_0)}x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t e^{-A(t-s)}A_1(s)x(s)ds$$

and

$$y(t) = e^{-A\gamma(t-t_0)}x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t e^{-A\gamma(t-s)}A_2(s)y(s)ds.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(t) - y(t)\|_\alpha &\leq \|(I - e^{-A(\gamma-1)(t-t_0)})A^\alpha e^{-A(t-t_0)}x_0\| \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \|(I - e^{-A(\gamma-1)(t-s)})A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)}A_1(s)x(s)\|ds \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \|A^\alpha e^{-A\gamma(t-s)}(A_1(s) - A_2(s))x(s)\|ds \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \|A^\alpha e^{-A\gamma(t-s)}A_2(s)(x(s) - y(s))\|ds \\ &\leq a_1(\varepsilon)\|x_0\|_\alpha + a_2 \int_{t_0}^t (t-s)^{-\alpha} \|x(s) - y(s)\|_\alpha ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $a_2 = C_\alpha \sup_s \|A_1(s)\|_{L(X^\alpha, X)}$ and $a_1(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma 2, there exists positive constant K_1 depending on α and Q such that

$$\|x(t) - y(t)\|_\alpha \leq K_1 a_1(\varepsilon) \|x_0\|_\alpha = R_2(\varepsilon) \|x_0\|_\alpha.$$

Lemma 4. *Let us consider Eq. (4) and*

$$\frac{dv}{dt} + (A + A_2(t))v = 0, \quad (12)$$

such that $A_2 : R \rightarrow L(X^\alpha, X)$ is a bounded and Hölder continuous function.

Then for $Q > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ and

$$\sup_t \|A_1(t) - A_2(t)\|_{L(X^\alpha, X)} \leq \varepsilon$$

the evolution operators $V(t, s)$ of (4) and $V_1(t, s)$ of (12) satisfy

$$\|(V(t, s) - V_1(t, s))u\|_\alpha \leq R_3(\varepsilon) |t - t_0|^{1-2\alpha+\delta} \|u\|_\delta, \quad t - s \leq Q, \quad (13)$$

with $R_3(\varepsilon) = R_3(\varepsilon, Q, \alpha)$ and $R_3(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Denote by $u(t)$ and $v(t)$ solutions of (4) and (12) with initial value $u(t_0) = v(t_0) = u_0$. They satisfy inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t) - v(t)\|_\alpha &\leq \int_{t_0}^t \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)} (A_1(s) - A_2(s)) u(s)\|_\alpha ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_0}^t \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)} A_2(s) (u(s) - v(s))\|_\alpha ds \\ &\leq C_\alpha L_Q \varepsilon \|u_0\|_\delta \int_{t_0}^t \frac{ds}{(t-s)^\alpha (s-t_0)^{\alpha-\delta}} + C_\alpha \|A_1\|_L \int_{t_0}^t \frac{\|u(s) - v(s)\|_\alpha ds}{(t-s)^\alpha} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|u_0\|_\delta R_4 + C_\alpha \|A_1\|_L \int_{t_0}^t \frac{\|u(s) - v(s)\|_\alpha ds}{(t-s)^\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Applying Lemma 2 to (14), we obtain (13).

We define the evolution operator for equation (4), (5) as

$$U(t, s) = V(t, s) \text{ if } \tau_k < s \leq t \leq \tau_{k+1}$$

and

$$U(t, s) = V(t, \tau_k)(I + B_k)V(\tau_k, \tau_{k-1}) \dots (I + B_m)V(\tau_m, s), \quad (15)$$

if $\tau_{m-1} < s \leq \tau_m < \tau_{m+1} < \dots < \tau_k < t \leq \tau_{k+1}$.

It is easy to verify that for fixed $t > s$ the operator $U(t, s)$ is bounded in the space X^α .

Definition 5. We say that the equation (4)–(5) has an exponential dichotomy on R with exponent $\beta > 0$ and bound $M \geq 1$ (with respect to the space X^α) if there exist projections $P(t), t \in R$, such that

- (i) $U(t, s)P(s) = P(t)U(t, s)$, $t \geq s$;
- (ii) $U(t, s)|_{Im(P(s))}$ for $t \geq s$ is an isomorphism on $Im(P(s))$, and then $U(s, t)$ is defined as an inverse map from $Im(P(t))$ to $Im(P(s))$;
- (iii) $\|U(t, s)(1 - P(s))u\|_\alpha \leq Me^{-\beta(t-s)}\|u\|_\alpha$, $t \geq s$, $u \in X^\alpha$;
- (iv) $\|U(t, s)P(s)\|_\alpha \leq Me^{\beta(t-s)}\|u\|_\alpha$, $t \leq s$, $u \in X^\alpha$.

If Eq. (4)–(5) has an exponential dichotomy on R , then the nonhomogeneous equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (A + A_1(t))u = f(t), \quad t \neq \tau_j, \quad (16)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t=\tau_j} = u(\tau_j + 0) - u(\tau_j) = B_j u(\tau_j) + g_j, \quad j \in Z, \quad (17)$$

has a unique solution bounded on R

$$u_0(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(t, s)f(s)ds + \sum_{j \in Z} G(t, \tau_j + 0)g_j, \quad (18)$$

where

$$G(t, s) = \begin{cases} U(t, s)(I - P(s)), & t \geq s, \\ -U(t, s)P(s), & t < s, \end{cases}$$

is the Green function such that

$$\|G(t, s)u\|_\alpha \leq Me^{-\beta|t-s|}\|u\|_\alpha, \quad t, s \in R. \quad (19)$$

Analogous to [9], p.250, it can be proven that a function $u(t)$ is a bounded solution of (16), (17) on the semiaxis $[t_0, +\infty)$ if and only if $u(t) =$

$$= U(t, t_0)(I - P(t_0))u(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{+\infty} G(t, s)f(s)ds + \sum_{t_0 \leq \tau_j} G(t, \tau_j + 0)g_j, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

A function $u(t)$ is bounded solution on the semiaxis $(-\infty, t_0]$ if and only if

$$u(t) = U(t, t_0)P(t_0)u(t_0) + \int_{-\infty}^{t_0} G(t, s)f(s)ds + \sum_{t_0 > \tau_j} G(t, \tau_j + 0)g_j, \quad t \leq t_0.$$

Now we estimate $\|G(t, s)u\|_\alpha$ for $u \in X$. Let $t > s$ and $\tau_{m-1} < s \leq \tau_m$, $\tau_k < t \leq \tau_{k+1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(t, s)u\|_\alpha &= \|U(t, s)(I - P(s))u\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \|U(t, \tau_m)(I - P(\tau_m))\|_\alpha \|U(\tau_m, s)u\|_\alpha \\ &\leq Me^{-\beta(t-\tau_m)} L_\Theta(\tau_m - s)^{-\alpha} \|u\| \leq \tilde{M}e^{-\beta(t-s)} |\tau_m - s|^{-\alpha} \|u\| \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(s, t)u\|_\alpha &= \|U(s, t)P(t)u\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \|U(s, t+1)P(t+1)u\|_\alpha \|A^\alpha U(t+1, t)u\| \leq \tilde{M}e^{-\beta(t-s)}\|u\|. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

If t_1 and t_2 belong to the same interval of continuity, then

$$\|P(t_1)u - P(t_2)u\|_\gamma \leq \tilde{M}_1 \|t_1 - t_2\|^\nu \|u\|_{\gamma+\nu} \quad (22)$$

since as in [9], p.247,

$$\begin{aligned} \|P(t+h)u - P(t)u\|_\gamma &\leq \|P(t)u - V(t+h, t)P(t)u\|_\gamma \\ &+ \|V(t+h, t)P(t)u - P(t+h)u\|_\gamma \\ &\leq \|(I - V(t+h, t))P(t)u\|_\gamma + \|P(t+h)(V(t+h, t)u - u)\|_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5. *Let the impulsive equation (4), (5) is exponentially dichotomous with positive constants β and M . Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the perturbed equations*

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (A + \tilde{A}(t))u = 0, \quad t \neq \tilde{\tau}_j, \quad (23)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t=\tilde{\tau}_j} = u(\tilde{\tau}_j + 0) - u(\tilde{\tau}_j) = \tilde{B}_j u(\tilde{\tau}_j), \quad j \in Z, \quad (24)$$

with $\sup_j |\tau_j - \tilde{\tau}_j| \leq \varepsilon$, $\sup_j \|B_j - \tilde{B}_j\| \leq \varepsilon$, $\sup_t \|A_1(t) - \tilde{A}(t)\|_{L((X^\alpha, X))} \leq \varepsilon$, are also exponentially dichotomous with some constants $\beta_1 \leq \beta$ and $M_1 \geq M$.

Proof. In Eq. (4), (5), we introduce the change of time $t = \vartheta(t')$ such that $\tau_j = \vartheta(\tilde{\tau}_j)$, $j \in Z$, and the function ϑ is continuously differentiable and monotonic on each interval $(\tilde{\tau}_j, \tilde{\tau}_{j+1})$.

The function ϑ can be chosen in piecewise linear form

$$t = a_j t' + b_j, \quad a_j = \frac{\tau_{j+1} - \tau_j}{\tilde{\tau}_{j+1} - \tilde{\tau}_j}, \quad b_j = \frac{\tau_j \tilde{\tau}_{j+1} - \tau_{j+1} \tilde{\tau}_j}{\tilde{\tau}_{j+1} - \tilde{\tau}_j} \quad \text{if } t' \in (\tilde{\tau}_j, \tilde{\tau}_{j+1}). \quad (25)$$

The function $\vartheta(t')$ satisfies the conditions

$$|\vartheta(t') - t'| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \left| \frac{d\vartheta(t')}{dt'} - 1 \right| \leq 2\varepsilon/\theta.$$

The equation (4), (5) in the new coordinates $v(t') = u(\vartheta(t'))$ has the form

$$\frac{dv}{dt'} + \frac{d\vartheta(t')}{dt'} (A + A_1(\vartheta(t'))) v = 0, \quad t \neq \tilde{\tau}_j, \quad (26)$$

$$\Delta v|_{t'=\tilde{\tau}_j} = v(\tilde{\tau}_j + 0) - v(\tilde{\tau}_j) = B_j v(\tilde{\tau}_j), \quad j \in Z. \quad (27)$$

Eq. (26), (27) has the evolution operator $U_1(t', s') = U(\vartheta(t'), \vartheta(s'))$. If Eq. (4), (5) has an exponential dichotomy with projector $P(t)$ at point t , then Eq. (26), (27) has an exponential dichotomy with projector $P_1(t') = P(\vartheta(t'))$ at point t' . Really,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_1(t', s')(1 - P_1(s'))\|_\alpha &= \|U(\vartheta(t'), \vartheta(s'))(1 - P(\vartheta(s'))\|_\alpha \\ &\leq M e^{-\beta(\vartheta(t') - \vartheta(s'))} \leq M e^{2\varepsilon} e^{-\beta(t' - s')}, \quad t \geq s. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality for an unstable manifold is proved analogously.

The linear equations (26), (27) and (23), (24) have the same points of impulsive actions $\tilde{\tau}_j, j \in Z$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d\vartheta(t')}{dt'} A_1(\vartheta(t')) - \tilde{A}(t') \right\| &\leq \left\| \frac{d\vartheta(t')}{dt'} A_1(\vartheta(t')) - A_1(\vartheta(t')) \right\| \\ &+ \|A_1(\vartheta(t')) - A_1(t')\| + \|A_1(t') - \tilde{A}(t')\| \leq K_2(\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where $K_2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Let $\tilde{U}(t', s')$ be the evolution operator for Eq. (23), (24). To show that for sufficiently small $\delta_0 > 0$ Eq. (23), (24) is exponentially dichotomous, we use the following variant of Theorem 7.6.10, [9]:

Assume that the evolution operator $U_1(t', s')$ has an exponential dichotomy on R and satisfies

$$\sup_{0 \leq t' - s' \leq d} \|U_1(t', s')\|_\alpha < \infty \quad (28)$$

for some positive d . Then there exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\|\tilde{U}(t', s') - U_1(t', s')\|_\alpha < \eta, \quad \text{whenever } t - s \leq d;$$

the evolution operator $\tilde{U}(t', s')$ also has an exponential dichotomy on R with some constants $\beta_1 \leq \beta, M_1 \geq M$.

To prove this statement, we set for $n \in Z$

$$t_n = s' + dn, \quad T_n = U_1(s' + d(n+1), s' + dn + 0), \quad \tilde{T}_n = \tilde{U}(s' + d(n+1), s' + dn + 0).$$

If the evolution operator $U_1(t, s)$ has an exponential dichotomy, then $\{T_n\}$ has a discrete dichotomy in the sense of [9, Definition 7.6.4].

According to Henry [9], Theorem 7.6.7, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\{\tilde{T}_n\}$ with $\sup_n \|T_n - \tilde{T}_n\|_\alpha \leq \eta$ has a discrete dichotomy.

Now we are in the conditions of [9], Exercise 10, p. 229–230 (see also a more general statement [5], Theorem 4.1), what finishes the proof.

Let us estimate the difference $\|\tilde{T}_k - T_k\|_\alpha$. There exists a positive integer N such that each interval of length d contains no more than N elements of sequence $\{\tau_j\}$. Let the interval $(\xi_n, \xi_{n+1}]$ contains points of impulses $\tilde{\tau}_m, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_k$ where $k - m \leq N$. Denote by $V_1(t, s)$ and $\tilde{V}(t, s)$ the evolution operators of equations without impulses (26) and (23), respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_n - \tilde{T}_n\|_\alpha &= \|U_1(\xi_{n+1}, \xi_n) - \tilde{U}(\xi_{n+1}, \xi_n)\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \|(V_1(\xi_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k) - \tilde{V}(\xi_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k))(I + B_k)V_1(\tilde{\tau}_k, \tilde{\tau}_{k-1}) \dots (I + B_m)V_1(\tilde{\tau}_m, \xi_n)\|_\alpha \\ &+ \|\tilde{V}(\xi_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k)(B_k - \tilde{B}_k)V_1(\tilde{\tau}_k, \tilde{\tau}_{k-1}) \dots (I + B_m)V_1(\tilde{\tau}_m, \xi_n)\|_\alpha + \dots \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \|\tilde{V}(\xi_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k)(I + \tilde{B}_k)\tilde{V}(\tilde{\tau}_k, \tilde{\tau}_{k-1}) \dots (I + \tilde{B}_m)(V_1(\tilde{\tau}_m, \xi_n) - \tilde{V}(\tilde{\tau}_m, \xi_n))\|_\alpha. \quad (29)$$

Using (11), we get that

$$\sup_n \|T_n - \tilde{T}_n\|_\alpha \leq K_3(\varepsilon)$$

with $K_3(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The exponentially dichotomous equation (23), (24) has Green's function

$$\tilde{G}(t, s) = \begin{cases} \tilde{U}(t, s)(I - \tilde{P}(s)), & t \geq s, \\ -\tilde{U}(t, s)\tilde{P}(s), & t < s, \end{cases}$$

such that

$$\|\tilde{G}(t, s)u\|_\alpha \leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1|t-s|} \|u\|_\alpha, \quad t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad u \in X^\alpha.$$

The sequence of bounded operators $T_n : X^\alpha \rightarrow X^\alpha$ defines the difference equation

$$u_{n+1} = T_n u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (30)$$

with evolution operator $T_{n,m} = T_{n-1} \dots T_m$, $n \geq m$, $T_{m,m} = I$. It is exponentially dichotomous with Green's function

$$G_{n,m} = \begin{cases} T_{n,m}(I - P_m), & n \geq m, \\ -T_{n,m}P_m, & n < m, \end{cases}$$

where $P_m = P(\xi_m)$. The second difference equation

$$u_{n+1} = \tilde{T}_n u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (31)$$

has evolution operator $\tilde{T}_{n,m} = \tilde{T}_{n-1} \dots \tilde{T}_m$, $n \geq m$, $\tilde{T}_{m,m} = I$.

By sufficiently small $\sup_n \|T_n - \tilde{T}_n\|_\alpha$, Eq. (31) is exponentially dichotomous with Green's function

$$\tilde{G}_{n,m} = \begin{cases} \tilde{T}_{n,m}(I - \tilde{P}_m), & n \geq m, \\ -\tilde{T}_{n,m}\tilde{P}_m, & n < m, \end{cases}$$

According to Henry [9], p. 233, the difference between two Green's functions satisfies equality

$$\tilde{G}_{n,m} - G_{n,m} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} G_{n,k+1}(\tilde{T}_k - T_k)\tilde{G}_{k,m} \quad (32)$$

and estimation

$$\|\tilde{G}_{n,m} - G_{n,m}\|_\alpha = M_2 e^{-\beta_2 d|n-m|} \sup_k \|\tilde{T}_k - T_k\|_\alpha, \quad n, m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (33)$$

with some constants $\beta_2 \leq \beta_1, M_2 \geq M_1$.

Now we can consider the difference of two Green's functions $\tilde{G}(t, s) - G_1(t, s)$. Let $t = s + nd + t_1, t_1 \in [0, d)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{G}(t, s) - G_1(t, s)\|_\alpha \\ &= \|\tilde{U}(s + nd + t_1, s + nd)\tilde{G}(s + nd, s) - U(s + nd + t_1, s + nd)G(s + nd, s)\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \|(\tilde{U}(s + nd + t_1, s + nd) - U(s + nd + t_1, s + nd))\tilde{G}(s + nd, s)\|_\alpha \\ &\quad + \|U(s + nd + t_1, s + nd)(\tilde{G}(s + nd, s) - G(s + nd, s))\|_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Using (33) and an estimation of the difference $\tilde{U} - U_1$ at a bounded interval as is done in (29), we get

$$\|\tilde{G}(t, \tau) - G_1(t, \tau)\|_\alpha \leq \tilde{M}_2(\varepsilon)e^{-\beta_2|t-\tau|}, \quad t, \tau \in R, \quad (34)$$

with $\tilde{M}_2(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

By the definition of Green's function, we have

$$\|\tilde{P}(\tau) - P_1(\tau)\|_\alpha \leq \tilde{M}_2(\varepsilon) \quad \text{for all } \tau \in R. \quad (35)$$

Corollary 1. *Let the conditions of Lemma 5 be satisfied. Then for $t \in R, |t - \tau_j| \geq \varepsilon, j \in Z$, we have*

$$\|(P(t) - \tilde{P}(t))u\|_\alpha \leq \tilde{M}_3(\varepsilon)\|u\|_{\alpha+\nu}, \quad (36)$$

where $\nu > 0, \alpha + \nu < 1$, and $\tilde{M}_3(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Using (22) and (35), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(P(t) - \tilde{P}(t))u\|_\alpha \leq \|(P(t) - P(\vartheta(t)))u\|_\alpha \\ & + \|(P(\vartheta(t)) - \tilde{P}(\vartheta(t)))u\|_\alpha + \|(\tilde{P}(\vartheta(t)) - \tilde{P}(t))u\|_\alpha \leq \tilde{M}_3(\varepsilon)\|u\|_{\alpha+\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

4 Almost Periodic Solutions of Equations with Fixed Moments of Impulsive Action

Consider the linear inhomogeneous equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (A + A_1(t))u = f(t), \quad t \neq \tau_j, \quad (37)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t=\tau_j} = u(\tau_j + 0) - u(\tau_j) = B_j u(\tau_j) + g_j, \quad j \in Z. \quad (38)$$

We assume that

(H7) the function $f(t) : R \rightarrow X$ is W -almost periodic and locally Hölder continuous with points of discontinuity at moments $t = \tau_j, j \in Z$, at which it is continuous from the left;

(H8) the sequence $\{g_j\}$ of $g_j \in X^{\alpha_1}, \alpha_1 > \alpha > 0$, is almost periodic.

Theorem 1. Assume that Eq. (37), (38) satisfy conditions **(H1)** – **(H3)**, **(H7)**, and **(H8)** and that the corresponding homogeneous equation is exponentially dichotomous.

Then the equation has a unique W -almost periodic solution $u_0(t) \in \mathcal{PC}(R, X^\alpha)$.

Proof. We show that an almost periodic solution is given by the formula (18). For $t \in (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$, it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_0(t)\|_\alpha &\leq \int_{-\infty}^t \|A^\alpha U(t, s)(I - P(s))f(s)\| ds \\
&+ \int_t^\infty \|A^\alpha U(t, s)P(s)f(s)\| ds + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|G(t, \tau_j + 0)g_j\|_\alpha \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|G(t, \tau_j + 0)g_j\|_\alpha + \int_{\tau_i}^t \|A^\alpha V(t, s)(I - P(s))f(s)\| ds \\
&+ \sum_{k=0}^\infty \int_{\tau_{i-k-1}}^{\tau_{i-k}} \|U(t, \tau_{i-k})(I - P(\tau_{i-k}))\|_\alpha \|A^\alpha U(\tau_{i-k}, s)f(s)\| ds \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_{\tau_{i+k}}^{\tau_{i+k+1}} \|U(t, \tau_{i+k+1})P(\tau_{i+k+1})\|_\alpha \|A^\alpha U(\tau_{i+k+1}, s)f(s)\| ds \\
&+ \int_t^{\tau_{i+1}} \|A^\alpha V(t, s)P(s)f(s)\| ds \leq \frac{2M}{1 - e^{-\theta\beta}} \frac{C_\alpha \Theta^{1-\alpha}}{1 - \alpha} \|f\|_{PC} \\
&+ \frac{2M}{1 - e^{-\theta\beta}} \sup_j \|g_j\|_\alpha \leq \tilde{M}_0 \max\{\|f(t)\|_{PC}, \|g_j\|_\alpha\}
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

with some constant $\tilde{M}_0 > 0$.

Take an ε -almost period h for the right-hand side of the equation, which satisfies conditions of Lemma 1; that is, there exists a positive integer q such that $\tau_{j+q} \in (s+h, t+h)$ if $\tau_j \in (s, t)$ and $|\tau_j + h - \tau_{j+q}| < \varepsilon$, $\|B_{j+q} - B_j\| < \varepsilon$.

Let $t \in (\tau_i + \varepsilon, \tau_{i+1} - \varepsilon)$. We define points $\eta_k = (\tau_k + \tau_{k-1})/2, k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_0(t+h) - u_0(t)\|_\alpha &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|G(t+h, \tau_{j+q} + 0)g_{j+q} - G(t, \tau_j + 0)g_j\|_\alpha \\
&+ \int_{-\infty}^\infty \|G(t+h, s+h)f(s+h) - G(t, s)f(s)\|_\alpha ds \\
&\leq \int_{-\infty}^\infty \|(G(t+h, s+h) - G(t, s))f(s+h)\|_\alpha ds \\
&+ \int_{-\infty}^\infty \|G(t, s)(f(s+h) - f(s))\|_\alpha ds + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|G(t, \tau_j + 0)(g_{j+q} - g_j)\|_\alpha \\
&+ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|(G(t+h, \tau_{j+q} + 0) - G(t, \tau_j + 0))g_{j+q}\|_\alpha.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Denote $U_2(t, s) = U(t+h, s+h)$. If $u(t) = U(t, s)u_0, u(s) = u_0$, is a solution of the impulsive equation (4), (5), then $u_2(t) = U(t+h, s+h)u_0, u_2(s) = u_0$, is a solution of the equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (A + A_1(t+h))u = 0, \quad t \neq \tau_{j+q} - h, \quad (41)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t+h=\tau_{j+q}} = u(\tau_{j+q} + 0) - u(\tau_{j+q}) = B_{j+q}u(\tau_{j+q}), \quad j \in Z. \quad (42)$$

We will use the notation $V_2(t, s) = V(t+h, s+h)$ for the evolution operator of the equation without impulses (41). Denote also $\tilde{\tau}_n = \tau_{n+q} - h, \tilde{B}_n = B_{n+q}$. Since Eq. (4), (5) is exponentially dichotomous, Eq. (41), (42) is exponentially dichotomous also with projector $P_2(s) = P(s+h)$.

The first integral in (40) is the sum of two integrals:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|(G(t+r, s+r) - G(t, s))f(s+r)\|_{\alpha} ds \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^t \|(U_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - U(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s+r)\|_{\alpha} ds \\ &+ \int_t^{\infty} \|(U_2(t, s)P_2(s) - U(t, s)P(s))f(s+r)\|_{\alpha} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

We estimate the first integral in (43); the second integral is considered analogously.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^t \|(U_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - U(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s+r)\|_{\alpha} ds \\ & \leq \int_{\tau_i+\varepsilon}^t \|A^{\alpha}(V_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - V(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s+r)\| ds \\ & + \int_{\tau_i-\varepsilon}^{\tau_i+\varepsilon} \|A^{\alpha}(U_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - U(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s+r)\| ds \\ & + \int_{\eta_i}^{\tau_i-\varepsilon} \|A^{\alpha}(U_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - U(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s+r)\| ds \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\eta_{i-k}}^{\eta_{i-k+1}} \|A^{\alpha}(U_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - U(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s+r)\| ds. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Let us consider all integrals in (44) separately. By (36) and (13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{11} &= \int_{\tau_i+\varepsilon}^t \|A^{\alpha}(V_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - V(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s+r)\| ds \\ &= \int_{\tau_i+\varepsilon}^t \|A^{\alpha}((I - P_2(t))V_2(t, s) - (I - P(t))V(t, s))f(s+r)\| ds \\ &\leq \int_{\tau_i+\varepsilon}^t \|A^{\alpha}(P_2(t) - P(t))V_2(t, s)f(s+r)\| ds \\ &+ \int_{\tau_i+\varepsilon}^t \|A^{\alpha}(I - P(t))(V_2(t, s) - V(t, s))f(s+r)\| ds \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\tau_i+\varepsilon}^t \frac{\tilde{M}_3(\varepsilon)L_Q ds}{(t-s)^{\alpha}} + \int_{\tau_i+\varepsilon}^t \frac{R_3(\varepsilon)ds}{(t-s)^{2\alpha-1}} \right) \|f\|_{PC} \leq \Gamma_1(\varepsilon)\|f\|_{PC}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{12} &= \int_{\tau_i - \varepsilon}^{\tau_i + \varepsilon} \|A^\alpha U(t, s)(I - P(s))f(s + h)\| ds \\
&\leq \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_i + \varepsilon} \|A^\alpha (I - P(t))V(t, s)f(s + h)\| ds \\
&\quad + \int_{\tau_i - \varepsilon}^{\tau_i} \| \|A^\alpha (I - P(t))V(t, \tau_i)(I + B_i)U(\tau_i, s)f(s + h)\| \| ds \\
&\leq \left(\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_i + \varepsilon} \frac{C_\alpha ds}{(t - s)^\alpha} M \|I + B_i\| \int_{\tau_i - \varepsilon}^{\tau_i} \frac{C_\alpha ds}{(s - \tau_i)^\alpha} \right) \|f\|_{PC} \\
&\leq \Gamma_2(\varepsilon) \|f\|_{PC}.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously,

$$I_{13} = \int_{\tau_i - \varepsilon}^{\tau_i + \varepsilon} \|A^\alpha U_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s))f(s + h)\| ds \leq \Gamma_3(\varepsilon) \|f\|_{PC},$$

where $\Gamma_j(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $j = 1, 2, 3$.

Using (13) and (36), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{14} &= \int_{\eta_i}^{\tau_i - \varepsilon} \|A^\alpha (U_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - U(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s + h)\| ds \\
&= \int_{\eta_i}^{\tau_i - \varepsilon} \| \left((I - P_2(t))V_2(t, \tilde{\tau}_i)(I + \tilde{B}_i)V_1(\tilde{\tau}_i, s) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (I - P(t))V(t, \tau_i)(I + B_i)V(\tau_i, s) \right) f(s + h) \|_\alpha ds \\
&\leq \int_{\eta_i}^{\tau_i - \varepsilon} \| (P_2(t) - P(t))V_2(t, \tilde{\tau}_i)(I + B_i)V_2(\tilde{\tau}_i, s)f(s + h) \|_\alpha ds \\
&\quad + \int_{\eta_i}^{\tau_i - \varepsilon} \| (I - P(t))(V_2(t, \tilde{\tau}_i) - V(t, \tau_i))(I + B_i)V_2(\tilde{\tau}_i, s)f(s + h) \|_\alpha ds \\
&\quad + \int_{\eta_i}^{\tau_i - \varepsilon} \| (I - P(t))V(t, \tau_i)(\tilde{B}_i - B_i)V_2(\tilde{\tau}_i, s)f(s + h) \|_\alpha ds \\
&\quad + \int_{\eta_i}^{\tau_i - \varepsilon} \| (I - P(t))V(t, \tau_i)(I - B_i)(V_2(\tilde{\tau}_i, s) - V(\tau_i, s))f(s + h) \|_\alpha ds \\
&\leq \Gamma_4(\varepsilon) \|f\|_{PC},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_4(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The last sum in (44) is transformed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{15} &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\eta_{i-k}}^{\eta_{i-k+1}} \|A^\alpha (U_2(t, s)(I - P_2(s)) - U(t, s)(I - P(s)))f(s + h)\| ds \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\eta_{i-k}}^{\eta_{i-k+1}} \| (U(t, \eta_i)(I - P(\eta_i))U(\eta_i, \eta_{i-k+1})U(\eta_{i-k+1}, s) \\
&\quad - U_2(t, \eta_i)(I - P_2(\eta_i))U_2(\eta_i, \eta_{i-k+1})U_2(\xi_{i-k+1}, s))f(s + h) \|_\alpha ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{\eta_{i-k}}^{\eta_{i-k+1}} \left\| \left((U(t, \eta_i) - U_2(t, \eta_i))(I - P(\eta_i))U(\eta_i, \eta_{i-k+1})U(\eta_{i-k+1}, s) \right. \right. \\ &\quad + U_2(t, \eta_i)((I - P(\eta_i))U(\eta_i, \eta_{i-k+1}) - (I - P_2(\eta_i))U_2(\eta_i, \eta_{i-k+1}))U(\eta_{i-k+1}, s) \\ &\quad \left. \left. + U_2(t, \eta_{i-k+1})(I - P_2(\eta_{i-k+1}))(U(\eta_{i-k+1}, s) - U_2(\eta_{i-k+1}, s)) \right) f(s+h) \right\|_{\alpha} ds. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 5, we construct in space X^{α} two sequences of bounded operators

$$S_n = U(\eta_{n+1}, \eta_n), \quad \tilde{S}_n = U_2(\eta_{n+1}, \eta_n), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and corresponding difference equations

$$u_{n+1} = S_n u_n, \quad v_{n+1} = \tilde{S}_n v_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Per our assumption, these difference equations are exponentially dichotomous with corresponding evolution operators

$$S_{n,m} = S_{n-1} \dots S_m, \quad \tilde{S}_{n,m} = \tilde{S}_{n-1} \dots \tilde{S}_m, \quad n \geq m,$$

and Green's functions

$$G_{n,m} = \begin{cases} S_{n,m}(I - P_m), & n \geq m, \\ -S_{n,m}P_m, & n < m, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{G}_{n,m} = \begin{cases} \tilde{S}_{n,m}(I - \tilde{P}_m), & n \geq m, \\ -\tilde{S}_{n,m}\tilde{P}_m, & n < m, \end{cases}$$

where $P_m = P(\eta_m)$, $\tilde{P}_m = P_2(\eta_m)$.

Analogous to (32) and (33), we obtain

$$\tilde{G}_{n,m} - G_{n,m} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} G_{n,k+1}(\tilde{S}_k - S_k)\tilde{G}_{k,m}$$

and

$$\|\tilde{G}_{n,m} - G_{n,m}\|_{\alpha} = M_1 e^{-\beta_1 \theta |n-m|} \sup_k \|\tilde{S}_k - S_k\|_{\alpha}, \quad n, m \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (45)$$

with some constants $\beta_1 \leq \beta$, $M_1 \geq M$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_n - \tilde{S}_n\|_{\alpha} &= \|U(\eta_{n+1}, \eta_n) - U_2(\eta_{n+1}, \eta_n)\|_{\alpha} \\ &= \|V(\eta_{n+1}, \tau_n)(I + B_n)V(\tau_n, \eta_n) - V_2(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n)(I + \tilde{B}_n)V_2(\tilde{\tau}_n, \eta_n)\|_{\alpha} \\ &\leq \|(V(\eta_{n+1}, \tau_n) - V_2(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n))(I + B_n)V(\tau_n, \eta_n)\|_{\alpha} \\ &\quad + \|V_2(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n)(B_n - \tilde{B}_n)V(\tau_n, \eta_n)\|_{\alpha} \\ &\quad + \|V_2(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n)(I + \tilde{B}_n)(V(\tau_n, \eta_n) - V_2(\tilde{\tau}_n, \eta_n))\|_{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we assume for definiteness that $\tilde{\tau}_n \geq \tau_n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(V(\eta_{n+1}, \tau_n) - V_2(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n))y\|_{\alpha} &\leq \|V(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n)(V(\tilde{\tau}_n, \tau_n) - I)y\|_{\alpha} \\ &\quad + \|(V(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n) - V_2(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n))y\|_{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \Gamma_5(\varepsilon)\|y\|_\alpha$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \| (V_2(\tilde{\tau}_n, \eta_n) - V(\tau_n, \eta_n))y \|_\alpha \leq \| (V_2(\tilde{\tau}_n, \tau_n) - I)V_2(\tau_n, \eta_n)y \|_\alpha \\ & + \| V_2(\tau_n, \eta_n) - V(\tau_n, \eta_n)y \|_\alpha \leq \Gamma_6(\varepsilon)\|y\|_\alpha \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_5(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ and $\Gamma_6(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Now we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|S_n - \tilde{S}_n\|_\alpha \leq \Gamma_5(\varepsilon)\|I + B_n\|\|U(\tau_n, \eta_n)\|_\alpha \\ & + \varepsilon\|U_2(\eta_n, \tau_n)\|_\alpha\|U(\tau_n, \eta_n)\|_\alpha + \Gamma_6(\varepsilon)\|U_2(\eta_{n+1}, \tilde{\tau}_n)\|_\alpha\|I + \tilde{B}_n\| \leq \Gamma_7(\varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

and by (45)

$$\|U(\eta_i, \eta_{i-k}) - U_2(\eta_i, \eta_{i-k})\|_\alpha \leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1 \theta k} \Gamma_7(\varepsilon), \quad (46)$$

where $\Gamma_7(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Continuing to evaluate I_{15} , we can obtain the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} & \|U_2(t, \eta_i)g\|_\alpha \leq M_2\|g\|_\alpha, \\ & \|(U(t, \eta_i) - U_2(t, \eta_i))g\|_\alpha \leq \Gamma_8(\varepsilon)\|g\|_\alpha, \\ & \int_{\xi_{i-k}}^{\eta_{i-k+1}} \|(U(\eta_{i-k+1}, s) - U_2(\eta_{i-k+1}, s))f(s+h)\|_\alpha ds \leq \Gamma_9(\varepsilon)\|f\|_{PC}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma_8(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ and $\Gamma_9(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, M_2 is some positive constant. Note that as earlier, $t \in (\tau_i + \varepsilon, \tau_{i+1} - \varepsilon)$.

Taking into account the last inequalities, we conclude that series I_{15} is convergent and there exists $\Gamma_{10}(\varepsilon)$ such that $I_{15} \leq \Gamma_{10}(\varepsilon)\|f\|_{PC}$ and $\Gamma_{10}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Using estimations for I_{11}, \dots, I_{15} , we get that there exists $\Gamma_{11}(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|(G(t+r, s+r) - G(t, s))f(s+r)\|_\alpha ds \leq \Gamma_{11}(\varepsilon)\|f\|_{PC} \quad (47)$$

and $\Gamma_{11}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

By Lemma 1, $|\tau_{j+q} - \tau_j - h| < \varepsilon$; therefore, $\tau_j + h + \varepsilon > \tau_{j+q}$ (we assume that $h > 0$ for definiteness). The difference $G(t, \tau_j + 0) - G(t+h, \tau_{j+q} + 0)$ is estimated as follows. Let $t - \tau_j \geq \varepsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(G(t, \tau_j + 0) - G(t+h, \tau_{j+q} + 0))g_{j+q}\|_\alpha \\ & = \|(U(t, \tau_j + 0)(I - P(\tau_j + 0)) - U(t+h, \tau_{j+q} + 0)(I - P(\tau_{j+q} + 0)))g_{j+q}\|_\alpha \\ & \leq \|(U(t, \tau_j + 0)(I - P(\tau_j + 0)) - U(t, \tau_j + \varepsilon)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon)))g_{j+q}\|_\alpha \\ & + \|(U(t, \tau_j + \varepsilon)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon)) - U(t+h, \tau_j + \varepsilon + h) \\ & \times (I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon + h)))g_{j+q}\|_\alpha + \|(U(t+h, \tau_{j+q} + 0)(I - P(\tau_{j+q} + 0)) \\ & - U(t+h, \tau_j + \varepsilon + h)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon + h)))g_{j+q}\|_\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The first and third differences are small due to the continuity of function $U(t, s)$ at intervals between impulse points:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \| (U(t, \tau_j + 0)(I - P(\tau_j + 0)) - U(t, \tau_j + \varepsilon)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon)))g_{j+q} \|_\alpha \\
& \leq \| U(t, \tau_j + \varepsilon)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon))(U(\tau_j + \varepsilon, \tau_j + 0) - I)g_{j+q} \|_\alpha \\
& \leq \| (I - P(t))U(t, \tau_j + \varepsilon) \|_\alpha \| (U(\tau_j + \varepsilon, \tau_j + 0) - I)g_{j+q} \|_\alpha \\
& \leq M e^{-\beta(t - \tau_j - \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{\alpha_1 - \alpha} C_{1-\alpha_1+\alpha} \varepsilon^{\alpha_1-\alpha} \|g_{j+q}\|_{\alpha_1}, \\
& \| (U(t + h, \tau_j + \varepsilon + h)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon + h)) \\
& - U(t + h, \tau_{j+q} + 0)(I - P(\tau_{j+q} + 0)))g_{j+q} \|_\alpha \\
& = \| U(t + h, \tau_j + \varepsilon + h)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon + h))(U(\tau_j + \varepsilon + h, \tau_{j+q} + 0) - I)g_{j+q} \|_\alpha \\
& \leq M e^{-\beta(t - \tau_j - \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{\alpha_1 - \alpha} C_{1-\alpha_1+\alpha} \varepsilon^{\alpha_1-\alpha} \|g_{j+q}\|_{\alpha_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second difference in (48) is estimated using inequality (46) and the following transformation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \| U(t, \tau_j + \varepsilon)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon)) - U(t + h, \tau_j + \varepsilon + h)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon + h)) \|_\alpha \\
& = \| U(t, \tau_j + \varepsilon)(I - P(\tau_j + \varepsilon)) - U_2(t, \tau_j + \varepsilon)(I - P_2(\tau_j + \varepsilon)) \|_\alpha \\
& = \| U(t, \eta_i)(I - P(\eta_i))U(\eta_i, \eta_{j+1})U(\eta_{j+1}, \tau_j + \varepsilon) \\
& - U_2(t, \eta_i)(I - P(\eta_i))U_2(\eta_i, \eta_{j+1})U_2(\eta_{j+1}, \tau_j + \varepsilon) \|_\alpha \\
& \leq \| (U(t, \eta_i) - U_2(t, \eta_i))(I - P(\eta_i))U(\eta_i, \eta_{j+1})U(\eta_{j+1}, \tau_j + \varepsilon) \|_\alpha \\
& + \| U_1(t, \eta_i)(P(\eta_i)U(\eta_i, \eta_{j+1}) - P_2(\eta_i)U_2(\eta_i, \eta_{j+1})U(\eta_{j+1}, \tau_j + \varepsilon)) \|_\alpha \\
& + \| U_2(t, \eta_i)P_2(\eta_i)U_2(\eta_i, \eta_{j+1})(U(\eta_{j+1}, \tau_j + \varepsilon) - U_2(\eta_{j+1}, \tau_j + \varepsilon)) \|_\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \| (G(t + h, \tau_{j+q} + 0) - G(t, \tau_j + 0))g_{j+q} \|_\alpha \leq \Gamma_{12}(\varepsilon) \sup_j \|g_j\|_{\alpha_1}, \quad (49)$$

where $\Gamma_{12}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The second integral and first sum in (40) are estimated as in (39):

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|G(t, s)(f(s + h) - f(s))\|_\alpha ds + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|U(t, \tau_j + 0)(g_{j+q} - g_j)\|_\alpha \leq M_3 \varepsilon$$

since h is ε -almost period of the right-hand side of the equation.

As a result of these evaluations, we get

$$\|u_0(t + h) - u_0(t)\|_\alpha \leq \Gamma(\varepsilon) \text{ for } t \in R, |t - \tau_j| > \varepsilon, j \in \mathbb{Z},$$

with $\Gamma(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The last inequality implies that the function $u_0(t)$ is W -almost periodic as function $R \rightarrow X^\alpha$.

Corollary 2. Assume that Eq. (37), (38) satisfies the following:

- i) conditions **(H1)** – **(H3)**, **(H7)**;
- ii) the sequence $\{g_j\}$ of $g_j \in X^\alpha$ is almost periodic;
- iii) the corresponding homogeneous equation is exponentially dichotomous.

Then the equation has a unique W -almost periodic solution $u_0(t) \in \mathcal{PC}(R, X^\gamma)$ with $\gamma < \alpha$.

Now we consider a nonlinear equation with fixed moments of impulsive action:

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (A + A_1(t))u = f(t, u), \quad t \neq \tau_j, \quad (50)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t=\tau_j} = u(\tau_j + 0) - u(\tau_j) = B_j u(\tau_j) + g_j(u(\tau_j)), \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (51)$$

Theorem 2. Let us consider Eq. (50), (51) in some domain $U_\rho^\alpha = \{x \in X^\alpha : \|x\|_\alpha \leq \rho\}$ of space X^α . Assume that

- 1) the equation satisfies assumptions **(H1)** – **(H4)**, $\tau_j = \tau_j(0)$;
- 2) the corresponding linear equation is exponentially dichotomous with constants $\beta > 0$ and $M \geq 1$;
- 3) the function $f(t, u) : R \times U_\rho^\alpha \rightarrow X$ is continuous in u , W -almost periodic and locally Hölder continuous in t uniformly with respect to $u \in U_\rho^\alpha$ and there exist constants $N_1 > 0$ and $\nu > 0$ such that

$$\|f(t_1, u_1) - f(t_2, u_2)\| \leq N_1(|t_1 - t_2|^\nu + \|u_1 - u_2\|_\alpha)$$

if $u_1, u_2 \in U_\rho^\alpha$, and points t_1 and t_2 belong to the same interval of continuity;

- 4) the sequence $\{g_j(u)\}$ of continuous functions $U_\rho^\alpha \rightarrow X^{\alpha_1}$ is almost periodic uniformly with respect to $u \in U_\rho^\alpha$ and $\|g_j(u_1) - g_j(u_2)\|_\alpha \leq N_1\|u_1 - u_2\|_\alpha$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Also $\|g_j(u_1) - g_j(u_2)\|_{\alpha_1} \leq N_1\|u_1 - u_2\|_{\alpha_1}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u \in U_\rho^\alpha \cap X^{\alpha_1}$ with some $\alpha_1 > \alpha$;

- 5) the functions $\|f(t, 0)\|_\alpha$ and $\|g_j(0)\|_{\alpha_1}$ are uniformly bounded for $t \in R$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$;
- 6) $N_1 M_* < 1$ and $\rho \geq M_0 M_* / (1 - N_1 M_*)$, where

$$M_* = \frac{M_1}{1 - e^{-\beta_1 \theta}} \left(1 + \frac{C_\alpha Q^{1-\alpha}}{1 - \alpha} \right)$$

and constants β_1 and M_1 are defined by Lemma 5.

Then in domain U_ρ^α for sufficiently small $N_1 > 0$ there exists a unique W -almost periodic solution $u_0(t)$ of Eq. (50), (51).

Proof. Denote by \mathcal{M}_ρ the set of all W -almost periodic functions $\varphi : R \rightarrow X^\alpha$ with discontinuity points τ_j , $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, satisfying the inequality $\|\varphi\|_{PC} \leq \rho$. In \mathcal{M}_ρ , we define the operator

$$(\mathcal{F}\varphi)(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(t, s)f(s, \varphi(s))ds + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} G(t, \tau_j + 0)g_j(\varphi(\tau_j)).$$

Proceeding in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 1, we proof that $(\mathcal{F}\varphi)(t)$ is a W-almost periodic function and $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{M}_\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\rho$ for $\rho > 0$ satisfying Condition 6).

Next, \mathcal{F} is a contracting operator in \mathcal{M}_ρ by sufficiently small $N_1 > 0$.

Hence, there exists $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{M}_\rho$ such that

$$\varphi_0(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(t, s) f(s, \varphi_0(s)) ds + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} G(t, \tau_j + 0) g_j(\varphi_0(\tau_j)).$$

The function $\varphi_0(t)$ is locally Hölder continuous on every interval (τ_j, τ_{j+1}) , $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Actually,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_0(t + \delta) - \varphi_0(t) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(t + \delta, s) f(s, \varphi_0(s)) ds - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(t, s) f(s, \varphi_0(s)) ds \\ &+ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} G(t + \delta, \tau_j + 0) g_j(\varphi_0(\tau_j)) - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} G(t, \tau_j + 0) g_j(\varphi_0(\tau_j)) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^t (V(t + \delta, t) - I) U(t, s) (I - P(s)) f(s, \varphi_0(s)) ds \\ &- \int_{t+\delta}^{\infty} (V(t + \delta, t) - I) U(t, s) P(s) f(s, \varphi_0(s)) ds \\ &+ \int_t^{t+\delta} V(t + \delta, s) (I - P(s)) f(s, \varphi_0(s)) ds + \int_t^{t+\delta} V(t, s) P(s) f(s, \varphi_0(s)) ds \\ &+ \sum_{\tau_j \leq t} (V(t + \delta, t) - I) U(t, \tau_j + 0) (I - P(\tau_j + 0)) g_j(\varphi_0(\tau_j)) \\ &+ \sum_{\tau_j > t} (V(t + \delta, t) - I) U(t, \tau_j + 0) P(\tau_j + 0) g_j(\varphi_0(\tau_j)). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (7), (20), (21), and (39), we conclude that for every interval $t \in (t', t'')$ not containing impulse points τ_j , there exists positive constant C such that $\|\varphi_0(t + \delta) - \varphi_0(t)\|_\alpha \leq C \delta^{\alpha_1 - \alpha}$.

The local Hölder continuity of $f(t, \varphi_0(t))$ follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(t, \varphi_0(t)) - f(s, \varphi_0(s))\| &\leq N_1 (|t - s|^\nu + \|\varphi_0(t) - \varphi_0(s)\|_\alpha) \\ &\leq C_1 (|t - s|^\nu + |t - s|^{\alpha_1 - \alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 37, [18], p. 214, if $\varphi_0(t)$ is W-almost periodic and $\inf_k (\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k) > 0$, then $\{\varphi_0(\tau_k)\}$ is an almost periodic sequence.

The linear inhomogeneous equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + (A + A_1(t))u = f(t, \varphi_0(t)), \quad t \neq \tau_j, \quad (52)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t=\tau_j} = u(\tau_j + 0) - u(\tau_j) = B_j u(\tau_j) + g_j(\varphi_0(\tau_j)), \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (53)$$

has a unique W-almost periodic solution in the sense of Definition 4. Due to the uniqueness, it coincides with $\varphi_0(t)$.

Hence, the W-almost periodic function $\varphi_0(t) : R \rightarrow X^\alpha$ satisfies Eq. (50) for $t \in (\tau_j, \tau_{j+1})$ and difference equation (51) for $t = \tau_j$.

Now we study the stability of the almost periodic solution assuming exponential stability of the linear equation. First, using ideas in [17], we prove following generalized Gronwall inequality for impulsive systems.

Lemma 6. *Assume that $\{t_j\}$ is an increasing sequence of real numbers such that $Q \geq t_{j+1} - t_j \geq \theta > 0$ for all j , M_1, M_2 , and M_3 are positive constants, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists a positive constant \tilde{C} such that positive piecewise continuous function $u : [t_0, t] \rightarrow R$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} z(t) \leq & M_1 z_0 + M_2 \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} (t_j - s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds + M_2 \int_{t_m}^t (t - s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds \\ & + M_3 \sum_{j=1}^m z(t_j) \quad \text{for } t \in (t_m, t_{m+1}] \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

also satisfies

$$z(t) \leq M_1 z_0 \tilde{C} \left(1 + M_2 \tilde{C} \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right)^m. \quad (55)$$

Proof. We apply the method of mathematical induction. At the interval $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ the inequality (54) has the form

$$z(t) \leq M_1 z_0 + M_2 \int_{t_0}^{\tau_1} (\tau_1 - s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds.$$

By Lemma 2 there exists \tilde{C} such that

$$0 \leq z(t) \leq M_1 z_0 \tilde{C}, \quad t \in [t_0, t_1], \quad \tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(M_1, M_2, Q). \quad (56)$$

Hence, (55) is true for $t \in [t_0, t_1]$. Assume (55) is true for $t \in [t_0, t_n]$ and prove it for $t \in (t_n, t_{n+1}]$. Hence, for $t \in (t_n, t_{n+1}]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} z(t) & \leq M_1 z_0 + M_2 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds + M_3 z(t_1) \\ & + M_2 \sum_{j=2}^n \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} (t_j - s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds + M_3 \sum_{j=1}^n z(t_j) + M_2 \int_{t_n}^t (t - s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds \\ & \leq M_1 z_0 + M_2 \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} M_1 z_0 \tilde{C} + M_3 M_1 z_0 \tilde{C} + M_2 \int_{t_n}^t (t - s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds \\ & + \sum_{j=2}^n \left(1 + M_2 \tilde{C} \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right)^j \left(M_2 \tilde{C} \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right) M_1 z_0 \\ & = M_1 z_0 + M_2 \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} M_1 z_0 \tilde{C} + M_3 M_1 z_0 \tilde{C} + M_2 \int_{t_n}^t (t - s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{j=2}^n \left(1 + M_2 \tilde{C} \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right)^{j-1} \left[\left(1 + M_2 \tilde{C} \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right) - 1 \right] M_1 z_0 \\
& \leq M_1 z_0 \left(1 + M_2 \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \tilde{C} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right)^n + M_2 \int_{t_n}^t (t-s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $t \in (t_n, t_{n+1}]$, the function $z(t)$ satisfies the inequality

$$z(t) \leq C_1 + M_2 \int_{t_n}^t (t-s)^{-\alpha} z(s) ds,$$

where $C_1 = M_1 z_0 \left(1 + M_2 \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \tilde{C} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right)^n$. Applying (56) at the interval $(t_n, t_{n+1}]$, we obtain (55). The lemma is proved.

Theorem 3. *Let Eq. (50), (51) satisfy assumptions of Theorem 2 and let the corresponding linear equation be exponentially stable.*

Then for sufficiently small $N_1 > 0$, the equation has a unique W -almost periodic solution $u_0(t)$, and this solution is exponentially stable.

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of the W -almost periodic solution $u_0(t)$ follows from Theorem 2. We prove its asymptotic stability. Let $u(t)$ be an arbitrary solution of the equation satisfying $\|u(t_0) - u_0(t_0)\|_\alpha \leq \delta$, where δ is small positive number.

Then by $t \geq t_0$ the difference of these solutions satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
u(t) - u_0(t) &= U(t, t_0)(u(t_0) - u_0(t_0)) + \int_{t_0}^t U(t, s) \left(f(s, u(s)) - \right. \\
&\quad \left. - f(s, u_0(s)) \right) ds + \sum_{t_0 \leq \tau_k \leq t} U(t, \tau_k + 0) (g_k(u(\tau_k)) - g_k(u_0(\tau_k))).
\end{aligned}$$

Then for $t_0 \in (\tau_0, \tau_1)$ and $t \in (\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|u(t) - u_0(t)\|_\alpha \leq \|U(t, t_0)(u(t_0) - u_0(t_0))\|_\alpha \\
& + \int_{t_0}^{\tau_1} \|U(t, \tau_1)\|_\alpha \|V(\tau_1, s)(f(s, u(s)) - f(s, u_0(s)))\|_\alpha ds + \dots \\
& + \int_{\tau_{j-1}}^{\tau_j} \|U(t, \tau_j)\|_\alpha \|V(\tau_j, s)(f(s, u(s)) - f(s, u_0(s)))\|_\alpha ds \\
& + \int_{\tau_j}^t \|V(t, s)(f(s, u(s)) - f(s, u_0(s)))\|_\alpha ds + \\
& + \sum_{t_0 \leq \tau_k \leq t} \|U(t, \tau_k + 0) (g_k(u(\tau_k)) - g_k(u_0(\tau_k)))\|_\alpha \\
& \leq M e^{-\beta(t-t_0)} \|u(t_0) - u_0(t_0)\|_\alpha + M e^{-\beta(t-\tau_1)} \int_{t_0}^{\tau_1} \frac{L_Q N_1}{(\tau_1 - s)^\alpha} \|u(s) - u_0(s)\|_\alpha ds \\
& + \dots + M e^{-\beta(t-\tau_j)} \int_{\tau_{j-1}}^{\tau_j} \frac{L_Q N_1}{(\tau_j - s)^\alpha} \|u(s) - u_0(s)\|_\alpha ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \int_{\tau_j}^t \frac{L_Q N_1}{(t-s)^\alpha} \|u(s) - u_0(s)\|_\alpha ds + \sum_{t_0 \leq \tau_k \leq t} M e^{-\beta(t-\tau_k)} N_1 \|u(\tau_k) - u_0(\tau_k)\|_\alpha$$

Denote $v(t) = e^{\beta t} \|u(t) - u_0(t)\|_\alpha$, $M_2 = e^{\beta Q} M L_Q N_1$, $M_3 = M N_1$. Then

$$v(t) \leq M v(t_0) + M_2 \int_{t_0}^{\tau_1} \frac{v(s) ds}{(\tau_1 - s)^\alpha} + \dots + M_2 \int_{t_j}^t \frac{v(s) ds}{(\tau_j - s)^\alpha} + M_3 \sum_{k=1}^j v(\tau_k).$$

Then by Lemma 6 we get

$$\|u(t) - u_0(t)\|_\alpha \leq M \tilde{C} e^{-\beta(t-t_0)} \left(1 + M_2 \tilde{C} \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right)^{i(t,t_0)} \|u(t_0) - u_0(t_0)\|_\alpha$$

Therefore, if

$$\beta > p \ln \left(1 + M_2 \tilde{C} \frac{Q^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} + M_3 \tilde{C} \right),$$

where p is defined by (3), then W-almost periodic solution $u_0(t)$ of Eq. (50), (51) is asymptotically stable. This can be achieved by sufficiently small N_1 .

5 Almost Periodic Solutions of Equations with Nonfixed Moments of Impulsive Action

We consider the following equation with points of impulsive action depending on solution

$$\frac{du}{dt} + Au = f(t, u), \quad t \neq \tau_j(u), \quad (57)$$

$$u(\tau_j(u) + 0) - u(\tau_j(u)) = B_j u + g_j(u), \quad j \in Z. \quad (58)$$

Definition 6. ([11]). A solution $u_0(t)$ of Eq. (57), (58) defined for all $t \geq t_0$, is called Lyapunov stable in space X^α if, for an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, there exists such a number $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, \eta)$ that, for any other solution $u(t)$ of system, $\|u_0(t_0) - u(t_0)\|_\alpha < \delta$ implies that $\|u_0(t) - u(t)\|_\alpha < \varepsilon$ for all $t \geq t_0$ such that $|t - \tau_j^0| > \eta$, where τ_j^0 are the times at which the solution $u_0(t)$ intersects the surfaces $t = \tau_j(u)$, $j \in Z$.

A solution $u_0(t)$ is said to be attractive, if for each $\varepsilon > 0$, $\eta > 0$, and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist $\delta_0 = \delta_0(t_0)$ and $T = T(\delta_0, \varepsilon, \eta) > 0$ such that for any other solution $u(t)$ of the system, $\|u_0(t_0) - u(t_0)\|_\alpha < \delta_0$ implies $\|u_0(t) - u(t)\|_\alpha < \varepsilon$ for $t \geq t_0 + T$ and $|t - \tau_k^0| > \eta$.

A solution $u_0(t)$ is called asymptotically stable if it is stable and attractive.

Theorem 4. Assume that in domain $U_p^\alpha = \{u \in X^\alpha, \|u\|_\alpha \leq \rho\}$ Eq. (57), (58) satisfies conditions (H1), (H3) – (H6), and

- 1) all solutions in domain U_ρ^α intersect each surface $t = \tau_j(u)$ no more than once;
 2) $\|f(t_1, u) - f(t_2, u)\| \leq H_1 |t_1 - t_2|$, $H_1 > 0$;
 3) $\|f(t, u_1) - f(t, u_2)\| + \|g_j(u_1) - g_j(u_2)\|_\alpha + |\tau_j(u_1) - \tau_j(u_2)| \leq N_1 \|u_1 - u_2\|_\alpha$,
 uniformly in $t \in R, u \in U_\rho^\alpha, j \in Z$. Also $\|g_j(u_1) - g_j(u_2)\|_1 \leq N_1 \|u_1 - u_2\|_1$ uniformly
 in $j \in Z, u \in U_\rho^\alpha \cap X^1$;
 4) $AB_j = B_j A$ and $\|f(t, 0)\| \leq M_0$, $\|g_j(0)\|_1 \leq M_0$ for all $j \in Z$;
 5) the linear homogeneous equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + Au = 0, \quad t \neq \tau_j, \quad (59)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t=\tau_j} = u(\tau_j + 0) - u(\tau_j) = B_j u(\tau_j), \quad j \in Z, \quad (60)$$

is exponentially stable in space X^α

$$\|U(t, s)u\|_\alpha \leq M e^{-\beta(t-s)} \|u\|_\alpha, \quad t \geq s, u \in X^\alpha,$$

where $\tau_j = \tau_j(0)$, $\beta > 0$ and $M \geq 1$;

6) $N_1 M_* < 1$ and $\rho \geq M_0 M_* / (1 - N_1 M_*)$, where

$$M_* = \frac{M_1}{1 - e^{-\beta_1 \theta}} \left(1 + \frac{C_\alpha Q^{1-\alpha}}{1 - \alpha} \right),$$

where constants β_1 and M_1 are defined by Lemma 5.

Then for sufficiently small values of Lipschitz constant N_1 , Eq. (57), (58) has in U_ρ^α a unique W -almost periodic solution and this solution is exponentially stable.

Proof. 1. First, using the method proposed in [6], we proof the existence of the W -almost periodic solution. Let $y = \{y_j\}$ be an almost periodic sequence of elements $y_j \in X^\alpha$, $\|y_j\|_\alpha \leq \rho$. We consider the equation with fixed moments of impulsive action

$$\frac{du}{dt} + Au = f(t, u), \quad t \neq \tau_j(y), \quad (61)$$

$$u(\tau_j(y_j) + 0) - u(\tau_j(y_j)) = B_j u(\tau_j(y_j)) + g_j(y_j), \quad j \in Z. \quad (62)$$

By Lemma 5, if a constant N_1 sufficiently small, then corresponding to (61) and (62) the linear impulsive equation (if $f \equiv 0$, $g_j(y_j) \equiv 0, j \in Z$) is exponentially stable. Its evolution operator $U(t, \tau, y)$ satisfies estimate

$$\|U(t, \tau, y)u\|_\alpha \leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau)} \|u\|_\alpha, \quad t \geq \tau,$$

with some positive constants $M_1 \geq M, \beta_1 \leq \beta$.

The equation (61), (62) has a unique solution bounded on the axis which satisfies the integral equation

$$u(t, y) = \int_{-\infty}^t U(t, \tau, y) f(\tau, u(\tau, y)) d\tau + \sum_{\tau_j(y_j) \leq t} U(t, \tau_j(y_j) + 0, y) g_j(y_j). \quad (63)$$

We choose $u_0(t, y) \equiv 0$ and construct the sequence of W-almost periodic functions $u_{n+1}(t, y) =$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^t U(t, \tau, y) f(\tau, u_n(\tau, y)) d\tau + \sum_{\tau_j(y_j) \leq t} U(t, \tau_j(y_j) + 0, y) g_j(y_j), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$

The proof of the W-almost periodicity of $u_{n+1}(t, y)$ in space X^α is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.

One can verify that for sufficiently small $N_1 > 0$ the sequence $\{u_n(t, y)\}$ converges to the W-almost periodic solution $u^*(t, y) : R \rightarrow X^\alpha$ of Eq. (63). As in the proof to Theorem 2, we prove that $u^*(t, y)$ is the W-almost periodic solution of impulsive equation (61), (62).

Let $t \in (\tilde{\tau}_i, \tilde{\tau}_{i+1})$, where $\tilde{\tau}_i = \tau_i(y_i)$. As in (39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^*(t, y)\|_\alpha &\leq \int_{-\infty}^t \|A^\alpha U(t, s, y) (f(s, 0) + f(s, u^*(s, y)) - f(s, 0))\|_\alpha ds \\ &+ \sum_{\tau_j(y_j) \leq t} \|U(t, \tilde{\tau}_j + 0, y) (g_j(0) + g_j(y_j) - g_j(0))\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \frac{M_1}{1 - e^{-\beta_1 \theta}} \left(\frac{C_\alpha \Theta^{1-\alpha}}{1 - \alpha} \left(M_0 + N_1 \sup_t \|u^*(t, y)\|_\alpha \right) + M_0 + N_1 \sup_j \|y_j\|_\alpha \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\sup_t \|u^*(t, y)\| \leq \rho$, where ρ satisfies Condition 6).

If we choose the almost periodic sequence $y^* = \{y_j^*\}, y_j^* \in X^\alpha$, such that

$$u^*(\tau_j(y_j^*), y^*) = y_j^*$$

for all $j \in Z$, then the function $u^*(t, y^*)$ will be exactly the W-almost period solution of Eq. (57), (58).

We consider the space \mathcal{N} of sequences $y = \{y_j\}$, $y_j \in X^\alpha$, with norm $\|y\|_S = \sup_j \|y_j\|_\alpha$ and map $S : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$,

$$S(y) = \{u^*(\tau_j(y_j), y)\}_{j \in Z}.$$

S maps the domain $\mathcal{N}_\rho = \{y \in \mathcal{N}, \|y\|_S \leq \rho\}$ into itself.

Now we proof that S is a contraction. Let, for definiteness, $\tilde{\tau}_j^1 = \tau_j(y_j) < \tilde{\tau}_j^2 = \tau_j(z_j)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(y)_j - S(z)_j\|_\alpha &= \|u^*(\tau_j(y_j), y) - u^*(\tau_j(z_j), z)\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \|u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^1, y) - u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^1, z)\|_\alpha + \|u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^1, z) - u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^2, z)\|_\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{J} = \cup_j \mathcal{J}_j, \quad \mathcal{J}_j = (\max\{\tilde{\tau}_{j-1}^1, \tilde{\tau}_{j-1}^2\}, \min\{\tilde{\tau}_j^1, \tilde{\tau}_j^2\}] = (\tau_{j-1}'', \tau_j').$$

Denote also $\xi_j = (\tau_j' + \tau_{j-1}'')/2$, $j \in Z$.

To estimate the difference $\|u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^1, y) - u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^1, z)\|_\alpha$, we apply iteration on n . Put $u_0(t, y) = u_0(t, z) = 0$. Then for $t \in (\tau_i'', \tau_{i+1}']$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|u_1(t, y) - u_1(t, z)\|_\alpha = \left\| \sum_{k \leq i} A^\alpha U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) g_k(y_k) - \sum_{k \leq i} A^\alpha U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^2 + 0, z) g_k(z_k) \right\| \\
& + I_0 \leq I_0 + \sum_{k \leq i} \|A^\alpha U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) (g_k(y_k) - g_k(z_k))\| + \|A^\alpha (U(t, \tilde{\tau}_i^1 + 0, y) \\
& - U(t, \tilde{\tau}_i^2 + 0, z)) g_i(z_i)\| + \sum_{k < i} \|A^\alpha (U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) - U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^2 + 0, z)) g_k(z_k)\| \\
& \leq I_0 + \sum_{k \leq i} M_1 e^{-\beta_1 |t - \tilde{\tau}_k^1|} N_1 \|y_k - z_k\|_\alpha + \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t - \tau_i'')} (e^{-A(\tau_i'' - \tau_i')} - I) g_i(z_i)\| \\
& + \sum_{k < i} \| (U(t, \xi_i, y) (U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, y) U(\xi_{k+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) \\
& - U(t, \xi_i, z) (U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, z) U(\xi_{k+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k^2 + 0, z)) g_k(z_k)) \|_\alpha \\
& \leq I_0 + \frac{M_1 N_1}{1 - e^{-\beta_1 \theta}} \|y - z\|_S + C_0 C_1 (t - \tau_i'')^{-\alpha} |\tau_i'' - \tau_i'| \|g_i(z_i)\|_1 \\
& + \sum_{k < i} \|A^\alpha (U(t, \xi_i, y) - U(t, \xi_i, z)) U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, y) U(\xi_{k+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) g_k(z_k)\| \\
& + \sum_{k < i} \|A^\alpha U(t, \xi_i, z) (U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, y) - U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, z)) U(\xi_{k+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) g_k(z_k)\| \\
& + \sum_{k < i} \|A^\alpha U(t, \xi_{k+1}, z) (U(\xi_{k+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) - U(\xi_{k+1}, \tilde{\tau}_k^2 + 0, z)) g_k(z_k)\|, \tag{65}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_0 = \int_{-\infty}^t \|A^\alpha (U(t, s, y) - U(t, s, z)) f(s, 0)\| ds.$$

To evaluate the difference $U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, y) - U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, z)$ we construct two sequences of bounded operators $X^\alpha \rightarrow X^\alpha$ defined by

$$T_n = U(\xi_{n+1}, \xi_n, y), \quad \tilde{T}_n = U(\xi_{n+1}, \xi_n, z), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The corresponding difference equations $u_{n+1} = T_n u_n$ and $u_{n+1} = \tilde{T}_n u_n$ are exponentially stable. Their evolution operators

$$T_{n,m} = T_{n-1} \dots T_m, \quad n \geq m, \quad T_{m,m} = I,$$

and

$$\tilde{T}_{n,m} = \tilde{T}_{n-1} \dots \tilde{T}_m, \quad n \geq m, \quad \tilde{T}_{m,m} = I,$$

satisfies equality

$$\tilde{T}_{n,m} - T_{n,m} = \sum_{k < n} T_{n,k+1} (\tilde{T}_k - T_k) \tilde{T}_{k,m}, \quad n \geq m.$$

Analogous to (32) and (33), we obtain

$$\|\tilde{T}_{n,m} - T_{n,m}\|_\alpha \leq M_2 e^{-\beta_2 \theta(n-m)} \sup_k \|\tilde{T}_k - T_k\|_\alpha, \quad n \geq m, \quad (66)$$

with some $\beta_2 \leq \beta_1, M_2 \geq M_1$.

Now we estimate the difference $\|\tilde{T}_n - T_n\|_\alpha$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_n - \tilde{T}_n\|_\alpha &= \|U(\xi_{n+1}, \xi_n, y) - U(\xi_{n+1}, \xi_n, z)\|_\alpha \\ &= \|e^{-A(\xi_{n+1} - \tilde{\tau}_n^1)}(I + B_n)e^{-A(\tilde{\tau}_n^1 - \xi_n)} - e^{-A(\xi_{n+1} - \tilde{\tau}_n^2)}(I + B_n)e^{-A(\tilde{\tau}_n^2 - \xi_n)}\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \|A^\alpha(e^{-A(\xi_{n+1} - \tilde{\tau}_n^1)} - e^{-A(\xi_{n+1} - \tilde{\tau}_n^2)})(I + B_n)e^{-A(\tilde{\tau}_n^1 - \xi_n)}\| \\ &\quad + \|A^\alpha e^{-A(\xi_{n+1} - \tilde{\tau}_n^2)}(I + B_n)(e^{-A(\tilde{\tau}_n^1 - \xi_n)} - e^{-A(\tilde{\tau}_n^2 - \xi_n)})\| \\ &\leq 2C_\alpha C_1(\theta/2)^{-1-\alpha}(1+b)|\tilde{\tau}_n^1 - \tilde{\tau}_n^2|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\tilde{T}_{n,m} - T_{n,m})u\|_\alpha &= \|(U(\xi_n, \xi_m, y) - U(\xi_n, \xi_m, z))u\|_\alpha \\ &\leq 2M_2 e^{-\beta_2 \theta(n-m)} C_\alpha C_1(\theta/2)^{-1-\alpha}(1+b) \sup_j |\tilde{\tau}_j^1 - \tilde{\tau}_j^2| \|u\|_\alpha, \quad n \geq m. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

To finish the estimation of (65), we consider the following two differences

$$\begin{aligned} \|(U(t, \xi_i, y) - U(t, \xi_i, z))u\|_\alpha &\leq \|A^\alpha(e^{-A(t - \tau_i')} (I + B_i)e^{-A(\tau_i' - \xi_i)} \\ &\quad - e^{-A(t - \tau_i'')} (I + B_i)e^{-A(\tau_i'' - \xi_i)})u\|_\alpha \leq \frac{4C_0 C_\alpha C_{1-\alpha}(1+b)}{\theta(t - \tau_i'')^\alpha} |\tau_i'' - \tau_i'| \|u\|_\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|(U(\xi_k, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) - U(\xi_k, \tilde{\tau}_k^2 + 0, z))u\|_\alpha &= \|A^\alpha(I - e^{-A(\tau_k'' - \tau_k')})e^{-A(\xi_{k+1} - \tau_k'')}u\| \\ &\leq C_0 C_1(2/\theta) |\tau_i'' - \tau_i'| \|u\|_\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Taking into account (66), (68) and (69), by (65) we obtain for $t \in (\tau_i'', \tau_{i+1}']$

$$\|u_1(t, y) - u_1(t, z)\|_\alpha \leq N_1 \|y - z\|_S (K_1' + K_1''(t - \tau_i'')^{-\alpha}) + I_0, \quad (70)$$

where the positive constants K_1' and K_1'' don't depend on i .

Now we consider the $(n+1)$ st iteration

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u_{n+1}(t, y) - u_{n+1}(t, z)\|_\alpha \\ &= \left\| \int_{-\infty}^t A^\alpha U(t, \tau, y) f(\tau, u_n(\tau, y)) d\tau + \sum_{k \leq i} A^\alpha U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) g_k(y_k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{-\infty}^t A^\alpha U(t, \tau, z) f(\tau, u_n(\tau, z)) d\tau - \sum_{k \leq i} A^\alpha U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^2 + 0, z) g_k(z_k) \right\| \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^t \|A^\alpha U(t, \tau, y) (f(\tau, u_n(\tau, y)) - f(\tau, u_n(\tau, z)))\| d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^t \|A^\alpha (U(t, \tau, y) - U(t, \tau, z)) f(\tau, u_n(\tau, z))\| d\tau \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{k \leq i} \|A^\alpha U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) (g_k(y_k) - g_k(z_k))\| \\
& + \sum_{k \leq i} \|A^\alpha (U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) - U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^2 + 0, z)) g_k(z_k)\|. \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (39), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\tau_i''}^t \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)} (f(\tau, u_n(\tau, y)) - f(\tau, u_n(\tau, z)))\| d\tau \\
& + \sum_{k < i} \int_{\tau_k''}^{\tau_{k+1}'} \|A^\alpha U(t, \tau, y) (f(\tau, u_n(\tau, y)) - f(\tau, u_n(\tau, z)))\| d\tau \\
& \leq \frac{M_1}{1 - e^{-\theta\beta_1}} \frac{C_\alpha \Theta^{1-\alpha}}{1 - \alpha} N_1 \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{J}} \|u_n(\tau, y) - u_n(\tau, z)\|, \\
& \sum_{k \leq i} \|A^\alpha U(t, \tilde{\tau}_k^1 + 0, y) (g_k(y_k) - g_k(z_k))\| \leq \frac{M_1}{1 - e^{-\theta\beta_1}} N_1 \|y - z\|_\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\|u_n(\tau, y)\|_\alpha \leq \rho$ and $\|u_n(\tau, z)\|_\alpha \leq \rho$, then for $t \in (\tau_i'', \tau_{i+1}']$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k \leq i} \int_{\tau_k''}^{\tau_k'} \|A^\alpha U(t, s, y) (f(s, u_n(s, y)) - f(s, u_n(s, z)))\| ds \\
& \leq \sum_{k \leq i} \int_{\tau_k''}^{\tau_k'} \|U(t, s, y) f(s, u_n(s, y))\|_\alpha ds + \sum_{k \leq i} \int_{\tau_k''}^{\tau_k'} \|U(t, s, y) f(s, u_n(s, z))\|_\alpha ds \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{k < i} M_1 e^{-\beta_1 |t - \tau_k''|} (M_0 + N_1 \rho) + 2 \int_{\tau_i''}^{\tau_i'} \|A^\alpha U(t, s, y)\| (M_0 + N_1 \rho) ds \\
& \leq \left(\frac{2M_1}{1 - e^{-\beta_1 \theta}} + \frac{2M_1}{1 - \alpha} (t - \tau_i'')^{-\alpha} \right) (M_0 + N_1 \rho) N_1 \|y - z\|_s, \tag{72}
\end{aligned}$$

since for $t > \tau_2 > \tau_1$

$$\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \frac{ds}{(t-s)^\alpha} \leq \frac{\tau_2 - \tau_1}{(1 - \alpha)((t - \tau_2)^\alpha)}.$$

The second integral in (71) satisfies the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 & = \int_{-\infty}^t \|A^\alpha (U(t, s, y) - U(t, s, z)) f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds \leq \int_{\tau_i''}^t \|A^\alpha (e^{-A(t-s)} \\
& - e^{-A(t-s)}) f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds + \int_{\tau_i'}^{\tau_i''} \|A^\alpha (U(t, s, y) - U(t, s, z)) f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds \\
& + \int_{\xi_i}^{\tau_i'} \|A^\alpha (U(t, s, y) - U(t, s, z)) f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{k < i} \int_{\xi_k}^{\xi_{k+1}} \|A^\alpha(U(t, s, y) - U(t, s, z))f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds. \quad (73)$$

We consider all integrals in (73) separately.

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21} &= \int_{\tau_i'}^{\tau_i''} \|A^\alpha U(t, s, y)f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds \leq \frac{C_\alpha(1+b)(M_0+N_1\rho)}{(1-\alpha)(t-\tau_i'')^\alpha} |\tau_i'' - \tau_i'|, \\ I_{22} &= \int_{\tau_i'}^{\tau_i''} \|A^\alpha U(t, s, z)f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds \leq \frac{C_\alpha(1+b)(M_0+N_1\rho)}{(1-\alpha)(t-\tau_i'')^\alpha} |\tau_i'' - \tau_i'|, \\ I_{23} &= \int_{\xi_i}^{\tau_i'} \|A^\alpha(U(t, s, y) - U(t, s, z))f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds \\ &= \int_{\xi_i}^{\tau_i'} \|A^\alpha(U(t, \tilde{\tau}_i^1, y)U(\tilde{\tau}_i^1, s, y) - U(t, \tilde{\tau}_i^2, z)U(\tilde{\tau}_i^2, s, z))f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds \\ &\leq \int_{\xi_i}^{\tau_i'} \|A^\alpha \left((e^{-A(t-\tilde{\tau}_i^1)} - e^{-A(t-\tilde{\tau}_i^2)})(I+B_i)e^{-A(\tilde{\tau}_i^1-s)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - A^\alpha e^{-A(t-\tilde{\tau}_i^2)}(I+B_i)(e^{-A(\tilde{\tau}_i^1-s)} - e^{-A(\tilde{\tau}_i^2-s)}) \right) f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds \\ &\leq \frac{2C_0C_{\alpha_1}C_{1+\alpha-\alpha_1}}{(t-\tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} (1+b) \frac{(\tau_i' - \xi_i)^{\alpha_1-\alpha}}{\alpha_1 - \alpha} |\tau_i'' - \tau_i'|, \quad \alpha_1 > \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The last sum in (73) is transformed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{24} &= \sum_{k < i} \int_{\xi_k}^{\xi_{k+1}} \|A^\alpha(U(t, s, y) - U(t, s, z))f(s, u_n(s, z))\| ds \\ &= \sum_{k < i} \int_{\xi_k}^{\xi_{k+1}} \| (U(t, \xi_i, y)U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, y)U(\xi_{k+1}, s, y) \\ &\quad - U(t, \xi_i, z)U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, z)U(\xi_{k+1}, s, z))f(s, u_n(s, z)) \|_\alpha ds \\ &\leq \sum_{k < i} \int_{\xi_k}^{\xi_{k+1}} \left(\| (U(t, \xi_i, y) - U(t, \xi_i, z))U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, y)U(\xi_{k+1}, s, y)f(s, u_n(s, z)) \|_\alpha \right. \\ &\quad + \| U(t, \xi_i, z)(U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, y) - U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, z))U(\xi_{k+1}, s, y)f(s, u_n(s, z)) \|_\alpha \\ &\quad \left. + \| U(t, \xi_i, z)U(\xi_i, \xi_{k+1}, z)(U(\xi_{k+1}, s, y) - U(\xi_{k+1}, s, z))f(s, u_n(s, z)) \|_\alpha \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

To finish the estimation of integral I_{24} we use (67), (68), (69) and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\xi_k}^{\xi_{k+1}} \|A^\alpha(U(\xi_{k+1}, s, y) - U(\xi_{k+1}, s, z))f\|_\alpha ds \\ &\leq \int_{\tau_k''}^{\xi_{k+1}} \|A^\alpha(e^{-A(\xi_{k+1}-s)} - e^{-A(\xi_{k+1}-s)})f\| ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{\tau_k'}^{\tau_k''} \|A^\alpha (e^{-A(\xi_{k+1}-\tau_k'')}(I+B_k)e^{-A(\tau_k''-s)} - e^{-A(\xi_{k+1}-s)})f\| ds \\
& + \int_{\xi_k}^{\tau_k'} \|(e^{-A(\xi_{k+1}-\tau_k')}(I+B_k)e^{-A(\tau_k'-s)} - e^{-A(\xi_{k+1}-\tau_k'')}(I+B_k)e^{-A(\tau_k''-s)})f\|_\alpha ds \\
& \leq \tilde{K}(\xi_{k+1} - \tau_k'')^{-\alpha_1} (1+b) |\tau_k'' - \tau_k'| \|f\|
\end{aligned}$$

with some positive constant \tilde{K} and $\alpha_1 > \alpha$. Therefore,

$$I_2 \leq N_1 \left(K_2' + \frac{K_2''}{(t - \tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) \|y - z\|_S \quad (74)$$

with $\alpha_1 > \alpha$ and positive constants K_2' and K_2'' independent on i, k .

By (70), (73), and (74) we obtain for $t \in (\tau_i'', \tau_{i+1}']$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_{n+1}(t, y) - u_{n+1}(t, z)\|_\alpha & \leq \sum_{k < i} \int_{\tau_k''}^{\tau_{k+1}'} \|A^\alpha U(t, \tau, y)(f(\tau, u_n(\tau, y)) \\
& - f(\tau, u_n(\tau, z)))\| d\tau + \int_{\tau_i''}^t \|A^\alpha U(t, \tau, y)(f(\tau, u_n(\tau, y)) \\
& - f(\tau, u_n(\tau, z)))\| d\tau + \left(K_3' + \frac{K_3''}{(t - \tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 \|y - z\|_S,
\end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

where the constants K_3' and K_3'' don't depend on n .

Let the n th iteration satisfies the inequality

$$\|u_n(t, y) - u_n(t, z)\|_\alpha \leq \left(L_n' + \frac{L_n''}{(t - \tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 \|y - z\|_S, \quad t \in (\tau_i'', \tau_{i+1}'],$$

with positive constants L_n' and L_n'' . We estimate the $(n+1)$ st iteration.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|u_{n+1}(t, y) - u_{n+1}(t, z)\|_\alpha \leq \left(K_3' + \frac{K_3''}{(t - \tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 \|y - z\|_S \\
& + N_1^2 \|y - z\|_S \sum_{k < i} \int_{\tau_k''}^{\tau_{k+1}'} \|A^\alpha U(t, s)\| \left(L_n' + \frac{L_n''}{(s - \tau_k'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) ds \\
& + N_1^2 \|y - z\|_S \int_{\tau_i''}^t \|A^\alpha U(t, s)\| \left(L_n' + \frac{L_n''}{(s - \tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) ds \\
& \leq N_1^2 \|y - z\|_S \left(\sum_{k < i} \int_{\tau_k''}^{\tau_{k+1}'} M_1 e^{-\beta_1 |t-s|} \left(L_n' + \frac{L_n''}{(s - \tau_k'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) ds \right. \\
& \left. + \int_{\tau_i''}^t \frac{M_1}{(t-s)^{\alpha_1}} \left(L_n' + \frac{L_n''}{(s - \tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) ds \right) + \left(K_3' + \frac{K_3''}{(t - \tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 \|y - z\|_S
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(\frac{M_1}{1 - e^{-\beta_1 \theta}} \left(L'_n Q + \frac{L''_n Q^{1-\alpha_1}}{1 - \alpha_1} \right) + \frac{L''_n M_1 2^{2\alpha}}{1 - \alpha_1} (t - \tau''_i)^{1-2\alpha_1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{L'_n M_1}{1 - \alpha_1} (t - \tau''_i)^{1-\alpha_1} \right) N_1^2 \|y - z\|_S + \left(K'_3 + \frac{K''_3}{(t - \tau''_i)^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 \|y - z\|_S \\
&= \left(L'_{n+1} + \frac{L''_{n+1}}{(t - \tau''_i)^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 \|y - z\|_S.
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

One can verify that for sufficiently small N_1 the sequences L'_n and L''_n are uniformly bounded by some constants L'_* and L''_* .

Since the sequences $u_n(t, y)$ and $u_n(t, z)$ tend to limit functions $u_*(t, y)$ and $u_*(t, z)$, respectively, we conclude by (76) for $t \in (\tau''_i, \tau'_{i+1}]$ that

$$\|u_*(t, y) - u_*(t, z)\|_\alpha \leq \left(L'_* + \frac{L''_*}{(t - \tau''_i)^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 \|y - z\|_S$$

and

$$\|u^*(\tau'_{i+1}, y) - u^*(\tau'_{i+1}, z)\|_\alpha \leq \left(L'_* + \frac{L''_*}{\theta^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 \|y - z\|_S. \tag{77}$$

Now we estimate the second summand in (64). Note that by our assumption $\tilde{\tau}_j^1 < \tilde{\tau}_j^2$.

$$\|u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^1, z) - u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^2, z)\|_\alpha = \left\| \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^1}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^2} \frac{d}{ds} u^*(s, z) ds \right\|_\alpha.$$

By Theorem 3.5.2, [9], at the interval (τ''_{j-1}, τ'_j) the derivative satisfies

$$\left\| \frac{d}{ds} u^*(s, z) \right\|_\gamma \leq \tilde{K}_1 (s - \tau''_{j-1})^{\alpha - \gamma - 1}$$

with some positive const \tilde{K}_1 independent of j and an initial value from U_ρ^α .

Then for $t \in (\tilde{\tau}_j^1, \tilde{\tau}_j^2)$

$$\left\| \frac{d}{ds} u^*(s, z) \right\|_\gamma \leq \tilde{K}_1 \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right)^{\alpha - \gamma - 1} = \tilde{K}_2$$

and

$$\|u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^1, z) - u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^2, z)\|_\alpha \leq \tilde{K}_2 |\tilde{\tau}_j^1 - \tilde{\tau}_j^2| \leq \tilde{K}_2 N_1 \|y - z\|_S. \tag{78}$$

By (77) and (78) we have

$$\|u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^1, z) - u^*(\tilde{\tau}_j^2, z)\|_\alpha = \Gamma_9 \|y - z\|_S, \tag{79}$$

where $\Gamma_9 < 1$ uniformly for j and $y, z \in \mathcal{N}_\rho$.

By (64), (77) and (79) we conclude that the map $S : \mathcal{N}_\rho \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_\rho$ is a contraction. Therefore, there exists unique almost periodic sequence $y^* = \{y_j^*\}$ such that $u^*(\tau_j(y_j^*), y^*) = y_j^*$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. The function $u^*(t, y^*)$ is W-almost periodic solution of the equation (57), (58).

2. Now we proof the stability of the almost periodic solution. Fix arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$. Let $t_0 \in [\tau_0(0) + \eta, \tau_1(0) - \eta]$.

The W-almost periodic solution $u_0(t)$ satisfies the integral equation

$$u_0(t) = U_0(t, t_0)u_0 + \int_{t_0}^t U_0(t, s)f(s, u_0(s))ds + \sum_{t_0 < \tau_j^0 < t} U_0(t, \tau_j^0 + 0)g_j(\tau_j^0),$$

where $\tau_j^0 = \tau_j(u_0(\tau_j^0))$ and $U_0(t, s)$ is the evolution operator of the linear equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + Au = 0, \quad u(\tau_j^0 + 0) - u(\tau_j^0) = B_j u(\tau_j^0), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

Let $u_1 \in X^\alpha$ such that $\|u_0 - u_1\|_\alpha < \delta$. The solution $u_1(t)$ with initial value $u_1(t_0) = u_1$ satisfies equation

$$u_1(t) = U_1(t, t_0)u_1 + \int_{t_0}^t U_1(t, s)f(s, u_1(s))ds + \sum_{t_0 < \tau_j^1 < t} U_1(t, \tau_j^1 + 0)g_j(\tau_j^1),$$

where $\tau_j^1 = \tau_j(u_1(\tau_j^1))$ and $U_1(t, s)$ is the evolution operator of the linear equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} + Au = 0, \quad u(\tau_j^1 + 0) - u(\tau_j^1) = B_j u(\tau_j^1), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

By Lemma 5, for a sufficiently small Lipschitz constant N_1 the evolution operator $U_0(t, s)$ satisfies the inequality

$$\|U_0(t, s)u\|_\alpha \leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-s)} \|u\|_\alpha, \quad t \geq s, \quad (80)$$

with some positive constants $\beta_1 \leq \beta$, $M_1 \geq M$. Moreover, one can verify that for some domain $U_{\tilde{\rho}}^\alpha, \tilde{\rho} \leq \rho$, and $N_1 \leq N_0$ the evolution operator U_1 satisfies

$$\|U_1(t, s)u\|_\alpha \leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-s)} \|u\|_\alpha, \quad t \geq s, \quad t, s \in [t_0, t_0 + T], \quad (81)$$

if the values $u_1(t)$ belong to $U_{\tilde{\rho}}^\alpha$ for $t \in [t_0, t_0 + T]$.

At the interval without impulses, the difference of solutions $u_0(t) - u_1(t)$ satisfies the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_1(t) - u_0(t)\|_\alpha &\leq \|e^{-A(t-t_1)}(u_0(t_1) - u_1(t_1))\|_\alpha \\ &+ \int_{t_1}^t \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)}(f(s, u_1(s)) - f(s, u_0(s)))\|_\alpha ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-t_1)} \|u_0(t_1) - u_1(t_1)\|_\alpha + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{M_1 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-s)}}{(t-s)^\alpha} \|u_1(s) - u_0(s)\|_\alpha ds.$$

Then by Lemma 2,

$$\|u_1(t) - u_0(t)\|_\alpha \leq M_1 \tilde{C} e^{-\beta_1(t-t_1)} \|u_1(t_1) - u_0(t_1)\|_\alpha, \quad t - t_1 \leq Q. \quad (82)$$

Hence, if initial values belong to the bounded domain from X^α , then the corresponding solutions are uniformly bounded for t from the bounded interval.

Assume for definiteness that $\tau_j^0 \geq \tau_j^1$ and estimate $|\tau_j^1 - \tau_j^0|$ by $(u_1(\tau_j^1) - u_0(\tau_j^1))$. By (78)

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u_1(\tau_j^1) - u_0(\tau_j^0))\|_\alpha &\leq \|(u_0(\tau_j^1) - u_0(\tau_j^0))\|_\alpha + \|u_0(\tau_j^1) - u_1(\tau_j^1)\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \left\| \int_{\tau_j^1}^{\tau_j^0} \frac{d}{d\xi} u_0(\xi) d\xi \right\|_\alpha + \|u_0(\tau_j^1) - u_1(\tau_j^1)\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \tilde{K}_2 |\tau_j^0 - \tau_j^1| + \|u_0(\tau_j^1) - u_1(\tau_j^1)\|_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$|\tau_j^0 - \tau_j^1| \leq N_1 \|u_0(\tau_j^0) - u_1(\tau_j^1)\|_\alpha \leq \frac{N_1}{1 - \tilde{K}_2 N_1} \|u_0(\tau_j^1) - u_1(\tau_j^1)\|_\alpha. \quad (83)$$

Denote $\tau_j' = \min\{\tau_j^0, \tau_j^1\}$, $\tau_j'' = \max\{\tau_j^0, \tau_j^1\}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$. We assume that $t \in (\tau_i'', \tau_{i+1}']$ and estimate the difference

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_0(t) - u_1(t)\|_\alpha &= \|U_0(t, t_0)(u_0 - u_1)\|_\alpha + \|(U_0(t, t_0) - U_1(t, t_0))u_1\|_\alpha \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^t \|U_0(t, s)f(s, u_0(s)) - U_1(t, s)f(s, u_1(s))\|_\alpha ds \\ &+ \left\| \sum_{t_0 < \tau_j^1 < t} U(t, \tau_j^1 + 0)g_j(\tau_j^1) - \sum_{t_0 < \tau_j^0 < t} U(t, \tau_j^0 + 0)g_j(\tau_j^0) \right\|_\alpha \\ &\leq \|U_0(t, t_0)(u_0 - u_1)\|_\alpha + \|(U_0(t, t_0) - U_1(t, t_0))u_1\|_\alpha \\ &+ \int_{t_0}^{\tau_1^1} \|U_0(t, s)f(s, u_0(s)) - U_1(t, s)f(s, u_1(s))\|_\alpha ds + \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \int_{\tau_j''}^{\tau_{j+1}'} \|(U_0(t, s) - U_1(t, s))f(s, u_1(s))\|_\alpha ds \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \int_{\tau_j''}^{\tau_{j+1}'} \|U_0(t, s)(f(s, u_0(s)) - f(s, u_1(s)))\|_\alpha ds \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^i \int_{\tau_j'}^{\tau_j''} \|U_0(t, s)f(s, u_0(s)) - U_1(t, s)f(s, u_1(s))\|_\alpha ds \\ &+ \int_{\tau_i''}^t \|U_0(t, s)f(s, u_0(s)) - U_1(t, s)f(s, u_1(s))\|_\alpha ds \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^i \|U_0(t, \tau_j^0 + 0)g_j(\tau_j^0) - U_1(t, \tau_j^1 + 0)g_j(\tau_j^1)\|_\alpha. \quad (84)$$

Denote $v(t) = \|u_0(t) - u_1(t)\|_\alpha$. Assume that for $t \in [t_0, \tau_i']$ the values $u(t)$ belong to $U_{\tilde{p}}^\alpha$; hence, the evolution operators $U_0(t, \tau)$ and $U_1(t, \tau)$ satisfy (80) and (81) at this interval. By (84), analogous to the proof of (70), (73), and (74), we conclude that there exist positive constants M_2 and P_1 independent of i such that for $t \in \mathcal{J}_{i+1}$

$$\begin{aligned} v(t) &\leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-t_0)} v(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{\tau_1'} M_2 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau_1'')} v(s) ds \\ &+ \sum_{j=2}^{i-1} \int_{\tau_{j-1}'}^{\tau_j'} M_2 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau_j'')} v(s) ds + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} P_1 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau_j'')} v(\tau_j') \\ &+ \frac{1}{(t-\tau_i'')^{\alpha_1}} \left(\int_{\tau_{i-1}'}^{\tau_i'} M_2 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau_i'')} v(s) ds + P_1 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau_i'')} v(\tau_i') \right) \\ &+ \int_{\tau_i''}^t M_2 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\alpha_1} v(s) ds, \quad \alpha_1 > \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Denote $\tilde{Q} = \max_j \{1, (\tau_{j+1}' - \tau_j'')\}$, $\tilde{\theta} = \min_j \{1, (\tau_{j+1}' - \tau_j'')\}$, $P_2 = P_1 e^{\beta_1 \sup_j |\tau_j'' - \tau_j'|}$, $M_3 = M_2 e^{\beta_1 \tilde{Q}}$. By (82), at the interval $[t_0, \tau_1']$ the function $v(t)$ satisfies

$$v(t) \leq M_1 \tilde{C} e^{-\beta_1(t-t_0)} v(t_0), \quad t \in [t_0, \tau_1']. \quad (86)$$

By (85) and (86), for $t \in (\tau_1'', \tau_2']$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} v(t) &\leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-t_0)} v(t_0) + \frac{1}{(t-\tau_1'')^{\alpha_1}} \int_{t_0}^{\tau_1'} M_2 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau_1'')} v(s) ds \\ &+ P_1 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-\tau_1'')} (t-\tau_1'')^{-\alpha_1} v(\tau_1') + \int_{\tau_1''}^t M_2 N_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\alpha_1} v(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $v_1(t) = e^{\beta_1 t} v(t)$

$$v_1(t) \leq M_1 v_1(t_0) \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C} (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(t-\tau_1'')^{\alpha_1}} \right) + \int_{\tau_1''}^t M_2 N_1 (t-s)^{-\alpha_1} v_1(s) ds.$$

By Lemma 2

$$v(t) \leq M_1 \tilde{C}_1 v(t_0) e^{-\beta_1(t-t_0)} \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C} (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(t-\tau_1'')^{\alpha_1}} \right), \quad t \in (\tau_1'', \tau_2'],$$

where \tilde{C}_1 is defined by (9).

Let us prove that $v(t) \leq$

$$\leq M_1 \tilde{C}_1 v(t_0) e^{-\beta_1(t-t_0)} \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_2 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(t - \tau''_j)^{\alpha_1}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_2 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(1 - \alpha_1) \tilde{\theta}^{\alpha_1}} \right)^{i-1} \quad (87)$$

for $t \in (\tau''_i, \tau'_{i+1}]$, $i \geq 2$. We apply the method of mathematical induction. Assume that (87) is true for $t \in (\tau''_{n-1}, \tau'_n]$ and prove it for $t \in (\tau''_n, \tau'_{n+1}]$. Really, by (85) for $t \in (\tau''_n, \tau'_{n+1}]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} v(t) &\leq M_1 e^{-\beta_1(t-t_0)} v(t_0) \left(1 + (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2) N_1 \tilde{C} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \mathcal{A}^j M_3 N_1 \tilde{Q} \tilde{C}_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \mathcal{A}^{j-1} \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{\tilde{\theta}^{\alpha_1}} \right) N_1 P_2 \tilde{C}_1 \\ &+ \mathcal{A}^{n-2} \left(N_1 M_2 \tilde{C}_1 (\tau'_n - \tau''_{n-1}) + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2) (\tau'_n - \tau''_{n-1})}{(1 - \alpha_1) (\tau'_n - \tau''_{n-1})^{\alpha_1}} \right) \\ &+ N_1 P_2 \tilde{C}_1 \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(\tau'_n - \tau''_{n-1})^{\alpha_1}} \right) + \mathcal{B}_n(t) \\ &\leq \mathcal{A} + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \mathcal{A}^{j-1} (1 + N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2) - 1) + \frac{\mathcal{A}^{n-1} N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(t - \tau''_n)^{\alpha_1}} \\ &+ \mathcal{B}_n(t) \leq \mathcal{A}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(t - \tau''_n)^{\alpha_1}} \right) + \mathcal{B}_n(t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A} = \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(1 - \alpha_1) \tilde{\theta}^{\alpha_1}} \right), \quad \mathcal{B}_n(t) = \int_{\tau''_n}^t \frac{M_3 N_1}{(t-s)^{\alpha_1}} e^{-\beta_1(t-s)} v(s) ds.$$

Hence, for $t \in (t_n, t_{n+1}]$, the function $v_1(t) = e^{\beta_1 t} v(t)$ satisfies the inequality

$$v_1(t) \leq \mathcal{A}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{(t - \tau''_n)^{\alpha_1}} \right) + M_3 N_1 \int_{\tau''_n}^t (t-s)^{-\alpha_1} v_1(s) ds.$$

Applying Lemma 2, we obtain (87).

Let $N_1 > 0$ be such that $\mathcal{A}^{i(t_0, t)} e^{-\beta_1(t-t_0)} < e^{-\delta_1(t-t_0)}$ for some positive δ_1 . For given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ we choose $v(t_0) = v_0$ such that

$$M_1 \tilde{C}_1 v_0 \left(1 + \frac{N_1 \tilde{C}_1 (M_3 \tilde{Q} + P_2)}{\eta^{\alpha_1}} \right) < \varepsilon.$$

This proves the asymptotic stability of solution $u_0(t)$.

Example 1. Let us consider the parabolic equation with impulses in variable moments of time

$$u_t = u_{xx} + a(t)u_x + b(t, x), \quad (88)$$

$$\Delta u \Big|_{t=\tau_j(u)} = u(\tau_j(u) + 0, x) - u(\tau_j(u), x) = -a_j u(\tau_j(u), x), \quad (89)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u(t, 0) = u(t, \pi) = 0, \quad (90)$$

where the sequence of surfaces $\tau_j(u)$ is defined by

$$\tau_j(u) = \theta_j + b_j \int_0^\pi u^2(\xi) d\xi, \quad j \in Z,$$

where the sequence of real numbers $\{\theta_j\}$ has uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences and $\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j \geq 1/2$,

$\{a_j\}$ and $\{b_j\}$ are almost periodic sequences of positive numbers,

$a(t)$ is a Bohr almost periodic function,

$b(t, x)$ is a Bohr almost periodic function in t uniformly with respect to $x \in [0, \pi]$ and belongs to $L_2(0, \pi)$ for all fixed t .

Denote

$$X = L_2(0, \pi), \quad A = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}, \quad X^1 = D(A) = H^2(0, \pi) \cap H_0^1(0, \pi).$$

The operator A is sectorial with simple eigenvalues $\lambda_k = k^2$ and corresponding eigenfunctions

$$\varphi_k(x) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{1/2} \sin kx, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

The operator $(-A)$ generates an analytic semigroup e^{-At} . Let $u = \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k \sin kx$, $a_k = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi u(x) \sin kx dx$. Then

$$Au = \sum_{k=1}^\infty k^2 a_k \sin kx, \quad A^\alpha u = \sum_{k=1}^\infty k^{2\alpha} a_k \sin kx, \quad e^{-At} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty e^{-k^2 t} a_k \sin kx.$$

Hence,

$$X^{1/2} = D(A^{1/2}) = H_0^1(0, \pi).$$

Let us consider Eq. (88) - (90) in space $X^{1/2} = D(A^{1/2}) = H_0^1(0, \pi)$:

$$\frac{du}{dt} + Au = f(t, u), \quad u(\tau_j(u) + 0) = (1 - a_j)u(\tau_j(u)), \quad j \in Z,$$

where $f(t, u) : R \times X^{1/2} \rightarrow X$, $f(t, u)(x) = a(t)u_x + b(t, x)$.

We verify that in some domain $\mathcal{D} = \{u \geq 0, \|u\| \leq \rho\}$ solutions of (88) - (90) don't have beating at the surfaces $t = \tau_j(u)$. Assume to the contrary that solution $u(t)$ intersects the surface $t = \tau_j(u)$ at two points t_j^1 and t_j^2 , $t_j^1 < t_j^2$.

Denote $u(t_j^1) = u_1, u(t_j^2) = u_2, \tilde{u} = e^{-A(t_j^2 - t_j^1)}u(t_j^1 + 0)$. Then $u(t_j^1 + 0) = (1 - a_j)u_1$, $\tau_j(u_1) = t_j^1$, $\tau_j(u_2) = t_j^2$, and

$$u_2 = e^{-A(t_j^2 - t_j^1)}u(t_j^1 + 0) + \int_{t_j^1}^{t_j^2} e^{-A(t_j^2 - s)}f(s, u(s))ds.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau_j(u_2) - \tau_j(\tilde{u})| &\leq b_j \int_0^\pi |(u_2(t, x) - \tilde{u}(t, x))(u_2(t, x) + \tilde{u}(t, x))| dx \\ &\leq b_j \|u_2(t, x) - \tilde{u}(t, x)\|_{L_2} \|u_2(t, x) + \tilde{u}(t, x)\|_{L_2} \\ &\leq b_j \int_{t_j^1}^{t_j^2} \|e^{-A(t_j^2 - s)}f(s, u(s))\|_{L_2} ds \|u_2(t, x) + \tilde{u}(t, x)\|_{L_2}. \end{aligned}$$

The function $f(t, u)$ satisfies $\|f(t, u)\|_X \leq K(1 + \|u\|_{X^{1/2}})$; hence, solutions of the equation without impulses exist for all $t \geq t_0$ and there exist positive constants M_1 and M_2 such that $M_2 \geq \sup_{u \in \mathcal{D}} \|f(t, u)\|_{L_2}$, $M_3 \geq \sup_{u \in \mathcal{D}} \|u_2(t, x) + \tilde{u}(t, x)\|_{L_2}$. Therefore, $|\tau_j(u_2) - \tau_j(\tilde{u})| \leq b_j |t_j^2 - t_j^1| M_2 M_3$. By sufficiently small $b = \sup_j b_j$ we have $b M_2 M_3 < 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< t_j^2 - t_j^1 = \tau_j(u_2) - \tau_j(u_1) \leq \tau_j(u_2) - \tau_j(\tilde{u}) + \tau_j(\tilde{u}) - \tau_j(u_1), \\ t_j^2 - t_j^1 &\leq \frac{1}{1 - b M_2 M_3} (\tau_j(\tilde{u}) - \tau_j(u_1)) \leq \frac{b_j((1 - a_j)^2 - 1)}{1 - b M_2 M_3} \|u_1\|_{L_2}^2 < 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts our assumption.

Corresponding to (88) - (90), the linear impulsive equation is exponentially stable in space $X^{1/2}$. By Theorem 4, for sufficiently small $b = \sup_j b_j$ and $a = \sup_t |a(t)|$ the equation has an asymptotically stable W-almost periodic solution.

6 Equations with unbounded operators B_j .

Many results in our paper remain true if operators B_j in linear parts of impulsive action are unbounded. We refer to [27], where the following semilinear impulsive differential equation

$$\frac{du}{dt} = Au + f(t, u), \quad t \neq \tau_j, \quad (91)$$

$$\Delta u|_{t=\tau_j} = u(\tau_j) - u(\tau_j - 0) = B_j u(\tau_j - 0) + g_j(u(\tau_j - 0)), \quad j \in Z, \quad (92)$$

was studied. Here $u : R \rightarrow X$, X is a Banach space, A is a sectorial operator in X , $\{B_j\}$ is a sequence of some closed operators, and $\{\tau_j\}$ is an unbounded and strictly increasing sequence of real numbers. Assume that the equation satisfies conditions $(H1), (H3), (H5), (H6)$ and

(H4u) the sequence $\{B_j\}$ of closed linear operators $B_j \in L(X^{\alpha+\gamma}, X^\alpha)$ is almost periodic in the space $L(X^{\alpha+\gamma}, X^\alpha)$, for $\alpha \geq 0$ and some $\gamma > 0$.

As in [17], we assume that solutions $u(t)$ of (91), (92) are right-hand-side continuous; hence $u(\tau_j) = u(\tau_j + 0)$ at all points of impulsive action. Due to such a selection we avoid considering operators $e^{-A(t-\tau_j)}(I + B_j)$ with unbounded operators B_j and can work with the family of bounded operators $e^{-A(t-\tau_j)}$.

Since the operator A is sectorial and operators B_j are subordinate to A , an evolution operator of a corresponding linear impulsive equation is constructed correctly. Now analogs of the theorems 2 and 3 can be proved.

Example 2. [27]. We consider the following parabolic equation with impulsive action:

$$u_t = u_{xx} + f(t, x), \quad (93)$$

$$\Delta u \Big|_{t=\tau_j} = u(\tau_j, x) - u(\tau_j - 0, x) = b_k(\sin x)u_x + c_k x(\pi - x), \quad (94)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u(t, 0) = u(t, \pi) = 0, \quad (95)$$

where $\{\tau_j\}$ is a sequence of real numbers with uniformly almost periodic sequences of differences, $\tau_{j+1} - \tau_j \geq \theta \geq 1/2$,

$\{b_j\}$ and $\{c_j\}$ are almost periodic sequences of real numbers,

$f(t, x)$ is almost periodic and locally Holder continuous with respect to t and for every fixed t belongs to $L_2(0, \pi)$.

As in Example 1, denote

$$X = L_2(0, \pi), \quad A = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}, \quad X^1 = D(A) = H^2(0, \pi) \cap H_0^1(0, \pi).$$

The operator A is sectorial with simple eigenvalues $\lambda_k = k^2$ and corresponding eigenfunctions $\varphi_k(x) = \sin kx, k = 1, 2, \dots$

If $u = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \sin kx$, $a_k = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi u(x) \sin kx dx$, then

$$B_j u = b_j \sin x u_x = b_j \sin x \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k k \cos kx = \frac{b_j}{2} (R - L) A^{1/2} u = b_j T A^{1/2} u,$$

where $Ru = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \sin(k-1)x$ and $Lu = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \sin(k+1)x$ are bounded shift operators in X . Hence, operators $B_j : X^{\alpha+1/2} \rightarrow X^\alpha$ are linear continuous, $\alpha \geq 0$.

Analogous to (15), the evolution operator for homogeneous equation (93), (94) is

$$U(t, s) = e^{-A(t-s)}, \quad \text{if } \tau_k \leq s \leq t < \tau_{k+1},$$

and

$$U(t, s) = e^{-A(t-\tau_k)}(I + B_k)e^{-A(\tau_k-\tau_{k-1})} \dots (I + B_m)e^{-A(\tau_m-s)}$$

if $\tau_{m-1} \leq s < \tau_m < \tau_{m+1} \dots \tau_k \leq t < \tau_{k+1}$, $m < k$, $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 5. *Let $p \ln(1+b) < 1$, where p is defined by (3) and $b = \sup_j |b_j|$. Then equation (93), (94) with boundary conditions (95) has a unique W -almost periodic solution which is asymptotically stable.*

Proof. We show that the unique almost periodic solution of (93) and (94) is given as function $R \rightarrow L_2(0, \pi)$ by formula

$$u_0(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t U(t, s) \tilde{f}(s) ds + \sum_{\tau_j \leq t} U(t, \tau_j) \tilde{g}_j,$$

where $\tilde{f}(t) \equiv f(t, \cdot) : R \rightarrow L_2(0, \pi)$, $g_j(x) = c_j x(\pi - x)$, $\tilde{g}_j = g_j(\cdot) : Z \rightarrow L_2(0, \pi)$.

First, $u_0(t)$ is bounded in space X^α . If $t \in [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^t \|U(t, s) \tilde{f}(s)\|_\alpha ds &\leq \int_{\tau_{i-1}}^{\tau_i} \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-\tau_i)} (I + B_i) e^{-A(\tau_i-s)} \tilde{f}(s)\| ds \\ &+ \int_{\tau_i}^t \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)} \tilde{f}(s)\| ds + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \int_{\tau_{i-k}}^{\tau_{i-k+1}} \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-\tau_i)} (I + B_i) e^{-A(\tau_i-\tau_{i-1})} \| \\ &\times \prod_{j=i-1}^{i-k+2} \|(I + B_j) e^{-A(\tau_j-\tau_{j-1})}\| \|(I + B_{i-k+1}) e^{-A(\tau_{i-k+1}-s)} \tilde{f}(s)\| ds, \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Next, we need the following inequality (see [17]), p. 35):

$$\|A^\alpha T A^\beta e^{-At}\| = \frac{1}{2} \|A^\alpha (R - L) A^\beta e^{-At}\| \leq \frac{4^\alpha + 1}{2} \|A^{\alpha+\beta} e^{-At}\|. \quad (97)$$

Then by (97):

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-\tau_i)} (I + B_i) e^{-A(\tau_i-s)}\| &\leq \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-s)}\| + \frac{5}{2} \|A^{\alpha+1/2} e^{-A(t-s)}\| \\ &\leq \left(C_\alpha (t-s)^{-\alpha} + \frac{5}{2} C_{\alpha+1/2} (t-s)^{-(\alpha+1/2)} \right) e^{-\delta(t-s)}. \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

From Henry [9], p. 25, we have

$$\|A^\alpha e^{-At} \psi\| < b_\alpha(t) \|\psi\|,$$

where $b_\alpha(t) = (te/\alpha)^{-\alpha}$ if $0 < t \leq \alpha/\lambda_1$, and $b_\alpha(t) = \lambda_1^\alpha e^{-\lambda_1 t}$ if $t \geq \alpha/\lambda_1$. Since $\|T\| = 1$, and $\lambda_1 = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I + B_j) e^{-A(\tau_j-\tau_{j-1})}\| &\leq \|e^{-A(\tau_j-\tau_{j-1})}\| + |b_j| \|A^{1/2} e^{-A(\tau_j-\tau_{j-1})}\| \\ &\leq (1 + |b_j|) e^{-(\tau_j-\tau_{j-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 < \varepsilon_1 < 1 - p \ln(1+b)$. Then there exists a positive integer k_1 such that for $k \geq k_1$

$$\frac{i(\tau_{i-k}, \tau_i)}{\tau_i - \tau_{i-k}} \ln(1+b) - 1 < -\varepsilon_1.$$

Denote $N_1 = \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_1} \exp(i(\tau_{i-k}, \tau_i) \ln(1+b) - (\tau_i - \tau_{i-k}))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j=i-k+1}^i \|(I + B_j)e^{-A(\tau_j - \tau_{j-1})}\| &\leq (1+b)^{i(\tau_{i-k}, \tau_i)} e^{-(\tau_i - \tau_{i-k})} \\ &\leq N_1 e^{-\varepsilon_1(\tau_i - \tau_{i-k})} \leq N_1 e^{-\varepsilon_1 \theta k}. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

For $t \in (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$, by (98) and (99) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|U(t, \tau_{i-k})\|_\alpha &\leq \|A^\alpha e^{-A(t-\tau_i)}(I + B_i)e^{-A(\tau_i - \tau_{i-1})}\| \times \\ &\times \prod_{j=i-k+1}^{i-1} \|(I + B_j)e^{-A(\tau_j - \tau_{j-1})}\| \leq K_1 e^{-\varepsilon_1(t-\tau_{i-k})} \end{aligned}$$

with constant K_1 independent of t and τ_{i-k} .

Using the last inequality, we obtain the boundedness of $\|u_0(t)\|_\alpha$. We can now proceed analogously to the proof of Theorem 1 and show the almost periodicity of $u_0(t)$.

References

1. Akhmet, M.: Principles of Discontinuous Dynamical Systems. Springer, New York (2010)
2. Akhmetov, M.U., Perestyuk, N.A.: Periodic and almost periodic solutions of strongly nonlinear impulse systems. J. Appl. Math. Mech. **56**, 829–837 (1992)
3. Akhmetov, M.U., Perestyuk, N.A.: Almost periodic solutions of nonlinear systems. Ukr. Math. J. **41**, 291–296 (1989)
4. Barreira, L., Valls, C.: Robustness for impulsive equations. Nonlinear Anal. **72**, 2542–2563 (2010)
5. Chow, S.-N., Leiva, H.: Existence and roughness of the exponential dichotomy for skew-product semiflow in Banach spaces. J. Differ. Equ. **120**, 429–477 (1995)
6. Haki R., Pinto M., Tkachenko V., Trofimchuk S.: Almost periodic evolution systems with impulse action at state-dependent moments. ArXiv preprint math/1511.07833 (2015)
7. Halanay, A., Wexler, D.: The Qualitative Theory of Systems with Impulse. Nauka, Moscow (1971)
8. Henriquez, H.R., De Andrade, B., Rabelo, M.: Existence of almost periodic solutions for a class of abstract impulsive differential equations. ISRN Math. Anal., Article ID 632687, 21 pp. (2011)
9. Henry, D.: Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 840, Springer, Berlin (1981)
10. Kmit, I., Recke, L., Tkachenko, V.I.: Robustness of exponential dichotomies of boundary-value problems for general first-order hyperbolic systems. Ukr. Math. J. **65**, 236–251 (2013)
11. Lakshmikantham, V., Bainov, D., Simeonov, P.S.: Theory of Impulsive Differential Equations. World Scientific, Singapore (1989)
12. Myslo, Y.M., Tkachenko, V.I.: Global attractivity in almost periodic single species models. Funct. Differ. Equ. **18**, 269–278 (2011)
13. Myslo, Y.M., Tkachenko, V.I.: Almost periodic solutions of Mackey-Glass equations with pulse action. Nonlinear Oscillations **14**, 537–546 (2012)

14. Naulin, R., Pinto, M.: Splitting of linear systems with impulses. *Rocky Mt. J. Math.* **29**, 1067–1084 (1999)
15. Pinto, M., Robledo, G.: Existence and stability of almost periodic solutions in impulsive neural network models. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **217**, 4167–4177 (2010)
16. Pliss, V.A., Sell, G.R.: Robustness of exponential dichotomies in infinite-dimensional dynamical systems. *J. Dyn. Diff. Equat.* **11**, 471–513 (1999)
17. Rogovchenko, Yu.V., Trofimchuk, S.I.: Periodic solutions of weakly nonlinear partial differential equations of parabolic type with impulse action and their stability. *Akad. Nauk Ukrain. SSR Inst. Mat.*, vol. 65, 44 pp (1986, Preprint)
18. Samoilenko, A.M., Perestyuk, N.A.: *Impulsive Differential Equations*. World Scientific, Singapore (1995)
19. Samoilenko, A.M.; Perestyuk, N.A.; Akhmetov, M.U.: Almost periodic solutions of differential equations with impulse action. *Akad. Nauk Ukrain. SSR Inst. Mat.*, vol. 26, 49 pp (1983, Preprint)
20. Samoilenko, A.M., Perestyuk, N.A., Trofimchuk, S.I.: Generalized solutions of impulse systems, and the beats phenomenon. *Ukr. Math. J.* **43**, 610–615 (1991)
21. Samoilenko, A.M., Trofimchuk, S.I.: Almost periodic impulse systems. *Differ. Equ.* **29**, 684–691 (1993)
22. Stamov, G.T.: *Almost Periodic Solutions of Impulsive Differential Equations*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2047. Springer, Berlin (2012)
23. Stamov, G.T., Alzabut, J.O.: Almost periodic solutions for abstract impulsive differential equations. *Nonlinear Anal.* **72**, 2457–2464 (2010)
24. Tkachenko, V.I.: On linear almost periodic pulse systems. *Ukr. Math. J.* **45**, 116–125 (1993)
25. Tkachenko, V.I.: On the exponential dichotomy of pulse evolution systems. *Ukr. Math. J.* **46**, 441–448 (1994)
26. Tkachenko, V.I.: On multi-frequency systems with impulses. *Nelineyni Kolyv.* **1**, 107–116 (1998)
27. Tkachenko, V.I.: Almost periodic solutions of parabolic type equations with impulsive action. *Funct. Diff. Equ.* **21**, 155–170 (2014)
28. Trofimchuk, S.I.: Almost periodic solutions of linear abstract impulse systems. *Differ. Equ.* **31**, 559–568 (1996)